DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 286 CE 007 306

TITLE	Maryland Community Service/Continuing Education Project (CS/CE Project): Final Project Report.
INSTITUTION	Maryland Univ., College Park. Conferences and Institutes Div.
PUB DATE	[76]
NOTE	113p.; Portions of Appendixes A and C may not reproduce well in microfiche due to poor contrast
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; *Adult Education Programs; Adult Educators; Communications; *Community Service Programs; *Inservice Education; Interinstitutional Cooperation; Leadership Training; Needs Assessment; Professional Continuing Education; Professional Education; *Professional Personnel; Program Administration; Program Development; *Program Improvement; Program Planning; Projects; Publicize; Public Relations; *Statewide Planning; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	Maryland

ABSTRACT

The Maryland Community Service and Continuing Education (CS/CE) project for strengthening CS/CE programs aimed: (1) to provide a continuing process for inservice training and development of personnel engaged in CS/CE; (2) to establish and maintain mechanisms for communication and cooperation among those involved in Maryland's CS/CE programs; and (3) to improve the CS/CE enterprise's ability to respond relevantly to and provide leadership for the changing educational needs of Maryland citizens. The project's constituency was professional staff within Maryland higher education institutions and other organizations who were primarily involved with the development, administration, or management of CS/CE programs. Specific 1976 training activities (summarized) were a series of workshops which addressed program planning and development, management, and program promotion, the needs which had ranked highest in a 1975 assessment. A newsletter and a series of dialogs (briefly described) answered communication needs. Participant feedback indicated reasonable success and validated the needs assessment findings. Included in the 30-page report are lists of participating faculty and project materials, and demographic data. Appended materials are comprised of: (1) the needs assessment instrument and survey results; (2) program planning committee rosters; (3) copies of the project newsletter; (4) workshop evaluation summaries; and (5) a newsletter critique. (AJ)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED126286

JUN 21 1976

Maryland State Agency

TITLE I, HEA FINAL PROJECT REPORT

PART A:

1. Project Title: Maryland Community Service/Continuing Education Project (CS/CE Project)

2. Location of Project: State of Maryland

3. Primary Institution of Higher Education: University of Maryland University College
Conferences and Institutes Division
University Blvd. at Adelphi Road
College Park, Maryland 20742

4. Cooperating Institutions of Higher Education: Higher Educational Institutions in State

5. Project Director: Dr. David E. Hartl, Assistant Director
Special Projects
Conferences and Institutes Division
University of Maryland University College
University Boulevard at Adelphi Road
College Park, Maryland 20742

6. Project Funds:

Federal Funds ....

Matching Funds ....

CE007306

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Project Staff and Advisory Committee.................................... ii

Introduction and Community Problem...................................... 1

Objectives of the Project... 1

Project Operations.. 4

Project Accomplishments... 13

Location Served By the Project.. 21

Prior History of the Project.. 21

Faculty Involvement... 21

Student Involvement... 26

Demographic Data.. 27

Project Materials... 28

Summary... 30

Appendix A - Needs Assessment Instrument and Survey Results.......... 33

Appendix B - Program Planning Committee Rosters...................... 70

Appendix C - Project Newsletter....................................... 75

Appendix D - Workshop Evaluation Summaries............................ 82

Appendix E - Newsletter Critique...................................... 107

PROJECT STAFF

Project Director

Dr. David E. Hartl, Assistant Director
Special Projects, C and I Division
University of Maryland University College
College Park, Maryland 20742

Advisory Committee Chairman

Dr. John H. Buskey, Director
Conferences and Institutes Division
University of Maryland University College
College Park, Maryland 20742

Project Coordinator

Mr. David Chittenden, Project Coordinator
CS/CE Project, C and I Division
University of Maryland University College
College Park, Maryland 20742

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. A. June Bricker
Department Head and State Leader
Home Economics
Cooperative Extension Service
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742

Mr. Howard S. Geer, Dean
Community Services
Montgomery Community College
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Dr. Keith E. Glancy
Director of the Division of
Special Programs
Evening College
The Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Mr. Larry Holmes
Training Coordinator
Catonsville Community College
c/o Koppers Company, Inc.
P.O. Box 626
Baltimore, Maryland 21203

Ms. Frances (Pat) Koonz
Director of Continuing Education
University of Maryland
School of Nursing
655 West Lombard Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Mr. Barry Mangum
Associate Director of Recreation
Maryland National Capitol Park and Planning
Commission
6600 Kenilworth Avenue
Riverdale, Maryland 20840

Dr. E. David Migocki
Specialist, School-Community Centers Program
Maryland State Department of Education
P.O. Box 8717
Baltimore, Maryland 21240

Mr. James L. Oates
Director of Continuing Education and
Community Services
Catonsville Community College
Catonsville, Maryland 21228

Dr. Beryl W. Williams, Dean
Center for Continuing Education
Morgan State University
Baltimore, Maryland 21239

7. INTRODUCTION AND COMMUNITY PROBLEM

The continuing education and community service needs existing within the State of Maryland are currently being served with varying levels of success and effectiveness by approximately 40 institutions of higher education and a variety of functionally related agencies and organizations.

Many of these Maryland institutions and organizations are unable to consistently and relevantly meet the variety of continuing education and community service needs of their constituencies within the State. This situation has often been attributed to the following factors:

1. inadequately trained professional, semi-professional and volunteer staffs within these organizations;
2. lack of systematic communication between; and
3. lack of cooperative or joint programming efforts among these service organizations.

The Maryland Community Service/Continuing Education (CS/CE) Project was conceived as a response to these specific needs.

8. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The overall purpose of the CS/CE Project has been to strengthen the many community service/continuing education programs conducted by institutions and organizations within the State of Maryland. The Project attempted to serve this overall purpose through acting upon the objectives and selected subobjectives which had been enunciated in the Project proposal. Not all of the subobjectives spelled out in the proposal were served.

Based upon direct feedback from the Title I reviewing committee which evaluated this proposal, it was apparent that many of the subobjectives as stated in the proposal were too global and would require some specific refocusing and redefinition in order for the Project to reasonably serve the major purpose it had declared. Therefore, the first task undertaken by the Statewide Advisory Committee was to respond to the feedback provided by the Title I committee and attempt to scale down the set of objectives through a critical reevaluation and prioritizing of each set of subobjectives. Each subobjective was examined in terms of its centricity to and usefulness in meeting the essential thrust of the major objective. In this manner and process of prioritizing, those subobjectives assigned low priority were determined not to be of critical value or importance in carrying out the intent of the major objective.

The entire set of objectives and subobjectives which appeared in the original proposal are listed below. Those given low priority are indicated as such.

1. To provide a continuing process for in-service training and development of personnel engaged in CS/CE:
   a. To continue professional in-service training in a variety of subject areas.
   b. To train CS/CE personnel to engage in joint problem-solving efforts with community organizations.
   c. To develop and implement planned sequences of skill development for CS/CE personnel.
   d. To provide educational programs for faculty and administrators in andragogical concepts. (Low priority)
   e. To encourage and influence the development of formal degree programs for professional development of CS/CE personnel. (Low priority)

f. To identify and establish a resource network of trainers and consultants in CS/CE and related areas (e.g., a Human Resources Bibliography). (Low priority)

2. To establish and maintain mechanisms for communication and cooperation among institutions, organizations and individuals involved in community services and continuing education in Maryland:

    a. To assemble on-going or ad hoc councils of deans and directors, programmers and developers, groups of institutions (or other natural configurations) to solve specific problems or discuss common concerns.

    b. To conduct conferences or meetings on topics of specific or general concern to community services, continuing education, and related personnel.

    c. To share information with and encourage interaction with other organizations concerned with adult and continuing education.

    d. To develop a mechanism(s) for collecting and disseminating information and data on programs, projects, and services.

    e. To explore and develop mechanisms for joint programming, cooperative programming and joint use of alternative delivery systems (Statewide or regional). (Low priority)

    f. To develop mechanisms for sharing administrators and faculty (e.g., a loan system, internships, sabbaticals, etc.). (Low priority)

3. To improve the CS/CE enterprise's ability to respond relevantly

to and provide leadership for the changing educational needs of Maryland citizens:

a. To develop ways for institutions to relate more effectively to the community.

b. To develop better mechanisms for determining needs, collecting relevant data, and setting priorities.

c. To develop ways to involve community members (those to be served) and staff in the process of responding to and providing leadership.

d. To improve staff capabilities of providing different types of leadership as different needs occur.

9. PROJECT OPERATIONS

The primary beneficiary and constituency of the CS/CE Project was defined as professional staff within Maryland higher education institutions who were primarily involved with the development, administration, or management of community service/continuing education programs. It was for this core group that the specific training activities were to be designed. It was also noted in the Project proposal (Section #9, 11, and 12) that professional staff of other types of organizations and institutions within the State which also provide programs of a CS/CE nature might also be served by this Project. At the initial meeting of the Project's Statewide Advisory Committee it was decided to ratify an increase in the scope of the Project by enlarging the target constituency to cover such organizations. Thus, in addition to serving the CS/CE staff within community colleges, 4-year colleges, and universities across the State, the Project would also serve the CS/CE staff within the variety of other organizations which provide CS/CE programs within the State. Such organizations included, but were not limited to, recreation and parks departments, libraries, voluntary, private or non-profit service organizations, health departments, etc.

The decision to enlarge the Project constituency in this manner resulted in large part from the following reasons:

1. Inviting adult educators regardless of organization to participate in Project activities would not undercut or lessen the impact and relevancy of the training activities to the original constituency. The professional adult educator who is involved in the planning, development, or administration of CS/CE programs performs certain basic tasks and functions requiring similar knowledge and skills regardless of the specific organizational setting.
2. It was hoped that an expanded constituency would facilitate communication and cooperative linkages among the variety of organizations currently serving the continuing education needs of Maryland communities and between higher education institutions and non-higher education institutions.

As a result of the decision to enlarge the Project constituency, the size and membership of the Statewide Advisory Committee was similarly modified to more accurately reflect and represent this "broadened" Project audience. The primary task of this reconstituted Advisory Committee was to help determine and to monitor the overall direction and thrust of the Project and to aid in the planning of specific Project training activities.

To best serve the training needs of this expanded Project constituency, a systematic Statewide needs assessment was conducted in September 1975. (See Appendix A for the complete survey instrument and survey results).

Four hundred and twenty-five surveys were mailed to a sample of the expanded Project constituency which was felt by the Advisory Committee to adequately represent the variety of CS/CE professionals that could potentially be served by this Project. Two hundred and twenty-five surveys (approximately 53%) were returned. Of the 30 specific subject areas included in the survey, those having to do with program planning and development, management, and program promotion were ranked the highest. This was found to be the case regardless of the specific organization or professional orientation of those responding to the survey. This finding seemed to validate the assumption on which the decision to broaden the constituency was based.

As a result of these findings, three planning committees were organized to design and develop specific training activities around these three major subject areas. Committees drawn from professional staff making up the Project constituency were formed with the intent that each committee would represent accurately the perspective and needs of the entire Project constituency. Each committee was charged with the responsibility of determining the number of programs within each content area, designing the format and process, as well as selecting the specific content emphasis and resource leadership of each program. Throughout this program development process, representatives from each of the program planning committees met with the Project's Statewide Advisory Committee to report on specific programming directions and progress. In this way, the Advisory Committee was able to monitor, maintain control over, and provide systematic input for the specific program activities being sponsored by the Project. In all, 22 individuals representing 17 different CS/CE institutions and organizations volunteered over 530 hours in the development and conduct of the Project's training programs. (See Appendix B).

In addition to this training function, the Project was committed to providing mechanisms for increasing the communication and cooperation among CS/CE professionals and among the variety of CS/CE organizations and institutions within the State. In this regard, the Project undertook the production of a bi-monthly newsletter entitled CS/CE Profile. The intent of the newsletter was threefold: (1) to provide a communication link in which topical events or current issues of interest to the CS/CE field could be shared; (2) to provide a vehicle in which various Project activities could be announced and recapped; and (3) to provide a means for evaluating and sharpening the common identity and purposes which the Statewide community of CS/CE organizations and institutions share. A copy of each issue of the CS/CE Profile is attached in Appendix C . In order to have as wide a dissemination as possible of the newsletter and other Project communications, the development of a comprehensive mailing list of CS/CE professionals within the State of Maryland was undertaken. This mailing list was continually updated throughout the Project to ensure a thorough coverage of the defined Project constituency.

In addition to the newsletter, the Project developed a series of "Dialogue Luncheons." In each luncheon of the series, there was a presentation by a panel or recognized leader in the CS/CE field which served to catalize and stimulate dialogue and discussion. To ensure easy communication and genuine dialogue, the attendance at these luncheons never exceeded 35 registrants. This series of Dialogue Luncheons served several important purposes:

1. To provide an opportunity to meet and share ideas in a less structured setting with CS/CE professionals from different types of organizations;
2. To provide an opportunity to interact with leadership in the CS/CE field; and
3. To provide a convenient means for examining current or general issues of concern affecting the CS/CE field.

After the scope of the Project was defined as providing these training and communication activities, the resources, energy, and attention of the Project staff focused upon carrying out those functions. Accordingly, specific Project activities were designed, scheduled and conducted through the late winter and spring of 1976. The activities described below are discussed sequentially according to the date on which each occurred.

Training Programs - Summary Descriptions

Styles of Leadership Workshop - February 25 and 26, 1976. Catonsville Community College.

Number of Participants: 18

Number of Institutions Represented: 12

Program Description: This two-day workshop was designed to help participants acquire an understanding of their leadership style and its impact on others through an explanation of the Managerial Grid model of Drs. Robert G. Blake and Jane S. Mouton. Specific participant objectives of the workshop included:

1. Understanding the impact one has on those with whom one works.
2. Developing better team skills and improving one's abilities to achieve better results through creative participation.
3. Improving one's ability to resolve and manage conflict in groups.

The workshop stressed active participant involvement in the solution of managerial problems through a number of specific small group activities. Participants had an opportunity through the use of several objective instruments to evaluate their own leadership behavior as well as identify and practice different strategies for solving problems.

Interviewing and Selecting Staff - March 2, 1976. University of Maryland University College Center of Adult Education.

Number of Participants: 23

Number of Institutions Represented: 9

Program Description: This workshop was designed to meet the needs of CS/CE personnel who are responsible for or take part in the process of selecting or hiring professional or support staff. The workshop provided participants an opportunity to learn a variety of interviewing principles and techniques including the following:

1. Developing criteria for evaluating applicants.
2. Systematically preparing and conducting an employment interview.
3. Establishing rapport with the interviewee.
4. Understanding and overcoming communication barriers in the interview.
5. Asking appropriate questions in line with E.E.O. requirements.

Practical Promotion Skills - March 23 and 24, 1976. University of Maryland University College Center of Adult Education.

Number of Participants: 108

Number of Institutions Represented: 46

Program Description: This two-day workshop was designed primarily for those within the CS/CE field whose professional responsibilities require some practical skills and knowledge of promotion. A major goal of the workshop was to provide the type of workshop structure and set of activities that would maximize the flexibility and opportunity to meet individual learning needs in this subject area. To meet this goal the workshop featured:

1. Four general sessions in which the basic concepts of promotion and elements of promotional strategies were presented.
2. Nine mini-workshop sessions which covered specific promotional skill areas. Participants had an opportunity to select and attend six of the nine sessions which were of greatest relevance to their personal needs.

3. A resource and exhibit room was set up in which participants could personally consult with general session leaders about specific promotional problems and in which a variety of promotional materials and resources were available.
4. A number of follow-up field trips were organized to reinforce material presented during the workshop.
5. A critique session at the final workshop session provided an opportunity for participants' promotional materials to be evaluated by a panel of resource experts.

Interviewing and Selecting Staff - March 31, 1976. University of Maryland University College Center of Adult Education.

Number of Participants: 26

Number of Institutions Represented: 17

Program Description: This workshop was the same as the workshop conducted on March 2, 1976. (See page 8)

Needs Assessment Workshop - April 5 and 6 and May 6, 1976. University of Maryland University College Center of Adult Education.

Number of Participants: 34

Number of Institutions Represented: 16

Program Description: This workshop was designed to provide participants with the following:

1. The context of needs assessment in problem solving and program development.
2. Procedures, techniques and other tools used in needs assessment.
3. Practical application of concepts and process of needs assessment.

The first two days of the workshop focused on the presentation and processing of a needs assessment model and the application of that model. The third day was designed to provide participants with an opportunity to share individual needs assessment projects and to explore a variety of assessment tools.

Improving Performance Evaluations - April 21, 1976 University of Maryland University College Center of Adult Education.

Number of Participants: 51

Number of Institutions Represented: 22

Program Description: This workshop was designed to improve the skills of those who are responsible for conducting performance evaluations of their employees. Specific learning objectives included:

1. Developing realistic expectations of evaluations.
2. Understanding the conditions under which evaluation is most effective.
3. Selecting the appropriate evaluation techniques and instruments.
4. Improving ones' overall skill as an evaluation interviewer.

The workshop involved participants in role playing practice interviews as well as critiquing actual evaluation instruments and techniques.

Styles of Leadership Workshop - April 28 and 29, 1976. The Wye Institute, Cheston-on-Wye, Queenstown, Maryland.

Number of Participants: 9

Number of Institutions Represented: 7

Program Description: This two-day workshop was identical to the one conducted at Catonsville Community College on February 25 and 26, 1976. (See page 8)

Working in An Ad Hoc Group - May 4, 1976. Johns Hopkins University, Evening College Center, Columbia, Maryland.

Number of Participants: 17

Number of Institutions Represented: 13

Program Description: This one-day workshop was designed especially for individuals who, in the normal course of their jobs, are occasionally called upon to lead or be a member of a short-term or ad hoc work group. Specific objectives included:

1. Identifying the steps necessary to form an effective working group.
2. Determining how the needs of group members affect the completion of group tasks.
3. Identifying reasons for the success or failure of short term work groups.
4. Identifying and applying an appropriate leadership strategy to a given work group situation.

Dialogue Luncheon Series

December 15, 1975. University of Maryland University College Center of Adult Education. This Luncheon discussion focused on the issue of probable futures and emerging realities which impact on and require the attention of the adult and continuing education profession. Twenty-three people participated; 15 institutions were represented.

February 6, 1976. University of Maryland University College Center of Adult Education. A panel representing a variety of continuing education organizations and legislators stimulated discussion around the topic of current or impending Federal legislation affecting the CS/CE enterprise, and several important issues and implications embedded in this subject. Thirty-five people participated; 16 institutions were represented.

March 12, 1976. University of Maryland at Baltimore. This Dialogue Luncheon examined the question of what could be the most effective relationship between the health/human services professions and continuing education agencies. Twenty four people participated; 16 institutions were represented.

April 30, 1976. University of Maryland University College Center of Adult Education. The central issue concerning participants at this Luncheon dealt with the community education movement and how several specific trends and problems have affected the movement. Ten people participated; 8 institutions were represented.

May 28, 1976. University of Maryland University College Center of Adult Education. Issues and implications in continuing education for the next five years was the focus for the last of the Dialogue Luncheons. Twenty three people participated; 13 institutions were represented.

10. PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. Evaluation

As is specified in the objectives, this Project charged itself with serving two major functions, those of training and communication.

In terms of the Project's training function, systematic evaluation was made through the application of a written evaluation instrument. With those Project activities fulfilling the communication function, evaluation was not as detailed, specific, or as systematic. Progress in fulfilling this function was assessed primarily by reaction and verbal feedback provided by the Advisory Committee.

Project objective 1 had to do with providing professional training and development activities for personnel engaged in CS/CE work. In carrying out this major objective, the Advisory Committee and Project staff decided to concentrate on developing and conducting a variety of specific workshops. This training emphasis served most directly subobjective 1.a. which dealt specifically with providing professional in-service training in a variety of subject areas. To a lesser degree, the emphasis on providing a number of workshops and training activities served to fulfill subobjective 1.b. (to train CS/CE personnel to engage in joint problem solving efforts with community organizations) and subobjective 1.c. (to develop and implement planned sequences of skill development for CS/CE personnel). The Needs Assessment workshop dealt with subobjective 1.b. by presenting a methodology and strategies for enabling CS/CE personnel to engage in joint analysis and problem solving efforts with community organizations.

Likewise, the management workshops, (Interviewing and Selecting Staff, Improving Performance Evaluation, Working in an Ad Hoc Group, and Leadership Skills) were a deliberate attempt to provide a sequence of skill development for CS/CE personnel (subobjective 1.c.) in a subject area deemed critically important by those individuals responding to the Project training needs assessment.

As indicated in the objectives section of this report, Project resources and energies were not directed toward: (a) providing educational programs for faculty and administrators in andragogical concepts (subobjective 1.d.); (b) encouraging or influencing the development of formal degree programs (subobjective 1.e.); or (c) establishing a resource network of trainers and consultants in the CS/CE area (subobjective 1.f.).

As the training concentration of the Project was serving objective 1 directly, it was serving to fulfill objective 3 indirectly. Objective 3 focused on the means for improving the CS/CE enterprise's ability to consistently and relevantly respond to the educational needs of Maryland citizens. Although there were a multitude of avenues in which the set of subobjectives for this objective could have been operationalized and acted upon by the Project, the primary avenue chosen by the Project Advisory Committee and staff was to attempt to upgrade the capability of professional staff within CS/CE organizations. As a result of such upgrading, the capacity of those organizations to achieve their specific programming and service objectives would be strengthened. Accordingly, specific training events were developed and conducted which were designed to: (1) enable participants to better determine and analyze community needs (subobjective 3.a. and 3.b.); and (2)to enable participants to work more effectively in various work groups as well as exhibit the appropriate leadership style as different needs occur (subobjectives 3.c. and 3.d.).

If the Project's training concentration served to act on objectives 1 and 3 overall, then one means of assessing the degree to which the Project succeeded in fulfilling those objectives can be determined from examining the participant evaluations of the specific training activities developed, conducted, and administered by the Project.

Each of the workshops was evaluated by the use of a short instrument designed to enable participants to rate along a four-point scale (one being lowest, four highest) a number of items concerning the design and conduct of the program. As can be seen from the summary table (see page 16), the evaluation results, with few exceptions, were uniformly high across all programs and across all categories of evaluation. Out of a possible 4.0 (highest), the overall composite rating for all workshops was 3.41 with a range from 3.01 to 3.72.

To the extent that results obtained from "immediate" post-workshop evaluations are valid, it appears that all the Project workshops were reasonably successful in achieving the stated goals of the workshops, as well as facilitating achievement of the varied personal goals of participants. Additionally, most participants rated highly the overall design of the workshops, the relevancy of the workshop content to their work, and the presentations and facilitation process of the workshop leader(s). These items were particularly critical since the workshops were designed and conducted as a response to the Statewide

WORKSHOP	OVERALL RATING	CLARITY OF STATED GOALS	ACHIEVEMENT OF STATED GOALS	ACHIEVEMENT OF PERSONAL GOALS	OVERALL DESIGN OF WORKSHOP	PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT IN WORKSHOP PROCESS	RELEVANCE OF CONTENT TO WORK	PRESENTATION/ FACILITATION OF
STYLES OF LEADERSHIP * February 25 and 26, 1976	3.44	3.70	3.60	3.40	3.20	3.40	3.60	3.20
INTERVIEWING & SELECTING STAFF March 2, 1976 **	3.52	3.80	3.33	3.20	3.50	3.20	3.80	3.90
PRACTICAL PROMOTION SKILLS March 23 and 24, 1976 (11 Resource People)	3.01	3.10	2.84	2.90	3.30	--	3.00 (2.73- 3.84)	2.92 (2.13- 2.69)
INTERVIEWING & SELECTING STAFF March 31, 1976 **	3.49	3.86	3.40	3.13	3.40	3.33	3.53	3.80
NEEDS ASSESSMENT April 5 and 6, 1976 and May 6	3.27	3.20	3.13	3.16	3.30	3.20	3.56	3.36
IMPROVING PERFORMANCE EVALUATION April 21, 1976	3.36	3.46	3.46	3.37	3.37	3.12	3.12	3.65
STYLES OF LEADERSHIP * April 28 and 29, 1976	3.72	4.0	3.70	3.70	3.70	3.50	3.50	4.0
WORKING IN AN AD HOC GROUP May 4, 1976	3.47	3.70	3.33	3.14	3.43	3.43	3.53	3.79
TOTAL - ALL WORKSHOPS	3.41	3.60	3.34	3.25	3.40	3.30	3.45	3.57

* Different Workshop Leaders
** Same Workshop Leader

needs assessment undertaken by the Project. These results, in fact, tend to validate the relevancy and accuracy of those needs assessment findings upon which many programming decisions were based. Complete individual workshop evaluation summaries as well as participant comments and suggestions are included in Appendix D.

Project objective 2 dealt with establishing mechanisms for communication and cooperation among institutions, organizations, and individuals providing CS/CE programs and services. Of the six subobjectives, the Project staff with Advisory Committee approval concentrated its resources and time on the Project newsletter and the series of CS/CE Dialogue Luncheons. These activities served to fulfill four of the six subobjectives (2.a., 2.b., 2.c., and 2.d.). Through feedback provided by the Project Advisory Committee as well as the participants, it appears that the series of five Dialogue Luncheons did have considerable success in assembling groups of CS/CE professionals to solve specific problems or discuss common concerns (subobjective 2.a.), providing a forum focusing on topics of specific or general concern to CS/CE personnel (subobjective 2.b.), and fostering the sharing of information and encouraging informal interaction among those involved with community service and continuing education (subobjective 2.c.).

This success can be attributed in large part to several factors:

1. The subjects for each luncheon discussion did, in fact, deal with areas of current interest to the Maryland CS/CE professional;
2. the informal nature of each luncheon was maintained by limiting attendance to 35;
3. there was generally a heterogeneous group of CS/CE professionals attending each luncheon. Such a variety of representatives from different CS/CE institutions served to stimulate discussion and facilitate exchange of information.

The newsletter was primarily intended to fulfill subobjective 2.d., which had as its purpose the development of mechanisms for collecting and disseminating information and data on programs, projects, and services of interest to CS/CE personnel. Although the newsletter was instrumental in serving to fulfill the communication function of this Project, it could have been more effective in disseminating a wider variety of information of interest to the CS/CE community. At the initiation of the newsletter, it was hoped that it would become a means for sharing ideas, information, and new developments affecting those in the field. However, to become such a communication mechanism, it required that many individuals (not merely the Project staff) contribute articles, newsworthy items, etc. This did not occur even though Project staff attempted to generate such support on several occassions.

The remaining subobjectives having to do with developing mechanisms for joint programming or joint use of alternative delivery systems (2.e.), and developing ways to share administrators and faculty--loan system, sabbaticals, etc. (2.f.), were not seriously pursued. However, there was general agreement among the Advisory Committee that these issues were of sufficient importance to devote greater Project energy should the Project be funded for an additional year.

In addition to those Project activities which were in response to specific Project objectives, several important corollary accomplishments occurred which need to be discussed. This Project was able to successfully expand its constituency from one restricted to CS/CE personnel located only within higher education institutions to one which included all Maryland CS/CE professionals regardless of the organizational or institutional setting. Over 300 CS/CE professionals representing approximately 100 different institutions and organizations throughout the State of Maryland participated in

Project activities. In terms of institutional participation, this represents a net percentage gain of approximately 300% over the institutional participation experienced in the previous year's Project. A continuing effort has been made for assembling a comprehensive mailing list of all Maryland organizations and personnel within those organizations which provide CS/CE programs and services. It was through this expanded mailing list that the anticipated constituency or target group for this Project was reached successfully. The cross fertilization of ideas and information which occurred with this expanded constituency at the various Project activities was not an effect easily measured. However, informal response and reaction concerning this benefit (often cited in participant comments on workshop evaluation forms) has been overwhelmingly positive. Said somewhat differently, one of the accomplishments of this Project has been to provide a forum and multiple opportunities in which professionals sharing common concerns and striving to achieve similar programming and service ends could meet, share views, exchange information, and establish initial "official" linkages that could benefit the quality and thoroughness of their respective organization's programming.

Another corollary accomplishment of the Project was the successful use of a participative program planning process by which the various training activities were developed. Twenty-two CS/CE professionals making up three program planning committees were invited to participate and to provide leadership and responsibility for the overall development of the Project's training activities. This dissemination of the Project's program development responsibilities not only made it possible to develop a greater number of high quality workshops, but it provided a unique learning and leadership experience for many of those committee members that could not have been duplicated within their respective organizations. Also, by using such a broad-based, participative program planning process, the groundwork was laid for developing the kind of inter-institutional, cooperative or joint program planning relationships which had been among the original subobjectives of the Project (subobjectives 2.e. and 2.f.).

B. Impact on Institutions of Higher Education

One major link this Project has had with various higher education institutions and their respective CS/CE programs has been in terms of the participation in Project training activities by the staffs of those institutions. Whatever impact this Project has had on each institution's on-going CS/CE program has been indirect. If, in fact, staff from these institutions have upgraded their professional skills as a result of participating in Project workshops, then it seems reasonable to conclude that such skill improvement would have some positive impact on the CS/CE programs for which they are responsible. However, the amount and quality of any such impact cannot be stated since there has been no formal study undertaken by this Project to determine how participation in various Project training programs may have affected the quality of an institution's on-going CS/CE program. Even though the impact cannot be systematically determined, one welcome by-product of this Project has been a decision by the Deans and Directors of Continuing Education and Community Services within the Maryland Community College system that the type of in-service, professional development education of their staffs undertaken by this Project will continue under their sponsorship. The willingness to carry on the training efforts initiated by this Project demonstrates the positive regard this Project has engendered during its tenure from one vital element of the total CS/CE enterprise in Maryland.

C. Impact on the Community

Because of the decision to expand the Project constituency as described earlier, a deliberate effort was made to include representatives from the variety of public and private agencies, state and local government units, as well as specific community groups in the planning and development of Project training activities. Of the total 22 members of the three program planning committees, 12 were from institutions and organizations other than higher education. Although there was no formal impact study undertaken by the Project, it is, nevertheless, likely that indirect benefits to the community were achieved through the increased professional development and growth of CS/CE personnel who attended the Project's training activities.

11. LOCATION SERVED BY THE PROJECT

This Project served a Statewide constituency.

12. PRIOR HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

This Project was essentially a continuation and expansion of the "Maryland Statewide Project to Strengthen Community Service Programs in Institutions of Higher Education" funded for the period September 1, 1973 - April 30, 1975. The expansion was focused on more sophisticated training efforts and the inclusion of community and other organizations involved in CS/CE programming.

13. FACULTY INVOLVEMENT

1. Robert Artz, Director
   Technical Publications and Services
   National Recreation Parks Association

   Panel Member - 1/2 day
   April 30, 1976 Dialogue Luncheon
   Community Education: What It Is - What It Isn't

2. Robert C. Bower, Management and Education Training Officer
   Department of Defense

   Workshop Leader - 2 days
   Styles of Leadership Workshop
   February 25 and 26, 1976

3. Chuck Cacace, Director of Continuing Education
School of Social Work and Community Development
University of Maryland at Baltimore

Panel Member - 1/2 day
March 12, 1976 Dialogue Luncheon
Health/Human Services Professions: Questions and Opportunities for Continuing Education

4. Newton Cattell, Chairman of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education

Panel Member - 1/2 day
February 6, 1976 Dialogue Luncheon
Federal Legislation Affecting the CS/CE Enterprise: Issues and Implications

5. John W. Churchill, Associate Professor of Recreation
University of Maryland, and
Commissioner, Maryland National Capitol Park and Planning Commission

Host/Moderator - 1/2 day
April 30, 1976 Dialogue Luncheon
Community Education: What It Is - What It Isn't

6. Esperanza Corson, President/General Manager
Bowie Graphic Arts Services, Inc.

Workshop Leader - 1 day
Practical Promotion Skills Workshop
March 23 and 24, 1976

7. Al Danegger, Director of Audio-Visual Services
University of Maryland

Workshop Leader - 1/2 day
Practical Promotion Skills Workshop
March 23 and 24, 1976

8. Lloyd Davis, Executive Director of the National University Extension Association

Panel Member - 1/2 day
February 6, 1976 Dialogue Luncheon
Federal Legislation Affecting the CS/CE Enterprise: Issues and Implications

9. Lynda Dial, Account Executive
Design and Production, Inc.

Workshop Leader - 1 day
Practical Promotion Skills Workshop
March 23 and 24, 1976

10. Robert Duckman, Music Director
W.A.S.H. Radio, F.M.

Workshop Leader - 1/2 day
Practical Promotion Skills Workshop
March 23 and 24, 1976

11. John R. Ervin, Dean
School of Continuing Education
Washington University

Host/Speaker - 1/2 day
May 28, 1976 Dialogue Luncheon
Issues and Implications in Continuing Education for the Next Five Years

12. Jim Henkelman, Acting Director
Office of Laboratory Experiences, College of Education
University of Maryland

Workshop Leader - 1 day
Working in an Ad Hoc Group
May 4, 1976

13. Mack E. Horsmon, Director of Personnel
University of Maryland Baltimore County

Workshop Leader - 1 day
Improving Performance Evaluations
April 21, 1976

14. Jim Hughes, Manager, Human Resources Development
Commercial Credit Company

Workshop Leader - 2 days
Styles of Leadership Workshop
April 28 and 29, 1976

15. Pat Hunt, Director, University Relations
University of Maryland

Workshop Leader - 1 day
Practical Promotion Skills Workshop
March 23 and 24, 1976

16. Frank Johnson, Group Counselor, Counseling Center
University of Maryland

Workshop Leader - 1 day
Working in an Ad Hoc Group
May 4, 1976

17. Frank Jones, Executive Director
American Lung Association of Maryland

Panel Member - 1/2 day
March 12, 1976 Dialogue Luncheon
Health/Human Services Professions: Questions and Opportunities for Continuing Education

18. Roger S. Karsk, President
CoRAL, II

Workshop Leader - 3 days
Needs Assessment Workshop
April 5 and 6 and May 6, 1976

19. Pat Koonz, Director of Continuing Education
School of Nursing
University of Maryland at Baltimore

Panel Member - 1/2 day
March 12, 1976 Dialogue Luncheon
Health/Human Services Professions: Questions and Opportunities for Continuing Education

20. Roland Kuniholm, Membership Director
National Trust for Historic Preservation

Workshop Leader - 1/2 day
Practical Promotion Skills Workshop
March 23 and 24, 1976

21. E. David Migocki, Specialist
School-Community Center Program
Maryland State Department of Education

Panel Member - 1/2 day
April 30, 1976 Dialogue Luncheon
Community Education: What It Is - What It Isn't

22. Leonard Nadler, Professor of Adult Education
George Washington University

Host/Moderator - 1/2 day
December 15, 1975 Dialogue Luncheon
Present View of Training and Education

23. Jim Oates, Director of Continuing Education and Community Services
Catonsville Community College

Host/Moderator - 1/2 day
March 12, 1976 Dialogue Luncheon
Health/Human Services Professions: Questions and Opportunities for Continuing Education

24. David Pesanelli, Design Consultant
David M. Pesanelli, Inc.

Workshop Leader - 1 day
Practical Promotion Skills Workshop
March 23 and 24, 1976

25. Bernard Posner, Executive Director
The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped

Workshop Leader - 1 day
Practical Promotion Skills Workshop
March 23 and 24, 1976

26. Dennis Roberts, Director of Orientation
University of Maryland

Workshop Leader - 1/2 day
Practical Promotion Skills Workshop
March 23 and 24, 1976

27. Susan Swenholt Crawford, Personnel Development Consultant, and
Faculty Member, Department of Agriculture Graduate School

Workshop Leader - 2 days
Interviewing and Selecting Staff Workshop
March 2 and March 31, 1976

28. Bill Thomas, Conference Coordinator
University of Maryland University College

Workshop Leader - 1 day
Working in an Ad Hoc Group Workshop
May 4, 1976

29. Jean W. Toomer, Private Community Relations Consultant, and
Participant in the Johns Hopkins Fellows Program

Workshop Leader - 3 days
Needs Assessment Workshop
April 5 and 6 and May 6, 1976

30. James Turman, Executive Director
National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education

Panel Member - 1/2 day
February 6, 1976 Dialogue Luncheon
Federal Legislation Affecting the CS/CE Enterprise: Issues and Implications

31. Roman Verhaalen, Dean of the Evening College
Johns Hopkins University

Host/Moderator - 1/2 day
February 6, 1976 Dialogue Luncheon
Federal Legislation Affecting the CS/CE Enterprise: Issues and Implications

32. Scott Walker, Director of Communications
National Training and Development Service

Workshop Leader - 1/2 day
Practical Promotion Skills Workshop
March 23 and 24, 1976

33. Eugene Welden, Chief of Community Services and Continuing Education Programs
U.S. Office of Education

Panel Member - 1/2 day
February 6, 1976 Dialogue Luncheon
Federal Legislation Affecting the CS/CE Enterprise: Issues and Implications

34. Elizabeth Wittenberg
Ernest Wittenberg and Associates, Inc.

Workshop Leader - 1/2 day
Practical Promotion Skills Workshop
March 23 and 24, 1976

14. STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

Ms. Robin Leftwich, a student with the School of Journalism, University of Maryland, interned with the Project. She aided in the production of the CS/CE newsletter "Profile" and following her internship, provided a summary report dealing with means for improving the newsletter (see Appendix E).

15. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

I. Demographic Summary

Males: 97 Females: 236

A. Age	Males	Females	%
Under 21	0	2	
21-35	41	109	45%
36-55	41	104	44%
Over 55	15	21	11%
B. Educational Level			
Elementary	0	0	
Junior High School	0	0	
High School	1	9	3%
College Below Baccalaureate	3	43	14%
Baccalaureate	26	80	32%
Graduate or Professional	67	104	51%
C. Occupational Classification			
Professional	89	187	83%
Semi-Professional	5	35	12%
Skilled	3	5	2%
Semi-Skilled	0	9	3%
Unskilled	0	0	
Other (specify)	0	0	

II. Narrative Description

As was described earlier in this report, the constituency for this Project was enlarged appreciably to include as many adult and continuing educators as possible regardless of the type of organization in which they work. The Project was quite successful in not only reaching this expanded constituency, but in attracting participation in and support for the variety of Project activities offered. Ninety-nine different institutions and organizations were represented by the 333 different individuals participating in one or more Project activities. Twenty-nine of those institutions represented the higher education enterprise in Maryland while the remaining 70 spanned the variety of non-higher educational CS/CE organizations within the State of Maryland. Over two-thirds of the participants were women and well over 80% of all participants had either a baccalaureate or graduate degree. Based upon position titles from workshop rosters, most participants held professional positions within their respective organizations. These positions were generally beginning to mid-level positions such as program development specialists, adult service librarians, community developers, conference coordinators, community service coordinators, health educators, district supervisors for county recreation and parks departments, etc. In short, the Project attracted the participant group it intended to reach; namely, professionals in a variety of institutions responsible for the planning, development, and administration or delivery of CS/CE programs.

16. PROJECT MATERIALS

A variety of learning and resource materials were used during the Project training activities. Whereas some of these were developed specifically for or by the Project, the majority were selected for use by the Project from already existing materials and resources.

A brief description of the materials used within each Project workshop follows. Copies of these materials are not available for dissemination and have not been included as appendices to this report.

Styles of Leadership Workshop

1. Bibliography of materials concerning the Managerial Grid model.
2. Conflict Management Survey by Jay Hall, Teleometrics, Intl.
3. Styles of Management Inventory by Jay Hall, Jerry P. Harvey, and Martha Williams, Teleometrics, Intl.

Interviewing and Selecting Staff Workshop

1. Bibliography of materials concerning area of interviewing skills and techniques.
2. Miscellaneous handouts detailing interviewing techniques, sample questions, common errors in interviewing (assembled by Ms. Susan Swenholt Crawford).

Practical Promotion Skills Workshop

1. If You Want Air Time, a publicity handbook from the National Association of Broadcasters.
2. Pointers for Publicists, published by the Public Affairs Department of the National Alliance of Businessmen.
3. Tips on Publicity, by Scott B. Walker, National Training and Development Service.
4. A Working Bibliography of Resources, compiled by the Project staff and program planning committee.
5. Creative Use of Direct Mail, by Roland Kuniholm, National Trust for Historic Preservation.
6. Improve Your Environment - Fight Pollution With Pictures, published by Consumer Markets Division, Eastman Kodak Company.

Needs Assessment Workshop

1. "Data Collection and Action Research," from Organizational Change: Techniques and Applications, by Newton Margulies and John Wallace.
2. "Organizing a Community Survey," from Studying Your Community, by Roland L. Warren.

Working in an Ad Hoc Group Workshop

1. A Guide to Leadership Effectiveness, by Miriam Burns, Gene Carnican and Jerry Lapides.

Improving Performance Evaluation Workshop

1. A variety of handouts concerning performance appraisal techniques prepared by Mr. Mack Horsmon.

PART B: SUMMARY

1. The Project was specifically concerned with strengthening the many CS/CE programs conducted by institutions and organizations within the State of Maryland.

2. This Project was considered to be both an on-campus and an off campus community service Project. The primary types of activities sponsored by the Project included the following categories: "B" Conference, "C" Workshop/ Seminar, and "H" Information Dissemination.

Four Project activities were conducted at off-campus sites:

Styles of Leadership Workshops

1. Catonsville Community College
2. The Wye Institute

March 12, 1976 Dialogue Luncheon

University of Maryland at Baltimore Student Union

Working in an Ad Hoc Group Workshop

Johns Hopkins University Evening College Center
Columbia, Maryland

All other programs conducted by the Project were held at the University of Maryland University College Center of Adult Education.

3. While the Project was not specifically designed to involve minority groups, 55 or 15% of the workshop participants were Black, while 4 participants were American Indian.

4. The Project sponsored one student in an internship for approximately four months. The student was involved with the production of the Project newsletter.

5. No "follow-up" evaluation will be conducted by this Project.

6. The geographical area served by the Project would fall in category "E" or "Statewide."

7. The primary problem area for the Project may be categorized as "Other" -"CS/CE in Maryland Institutions and Organizations."

8. This Project was a new program.

9. A request has been made for the continuation of funding in the next fiscal year under Title I for this Project.

10. The "primary" type of activity undertaken by the Project has been "workshops/seminars."

11. The major source of non-federal matching funds has come from "institutional funds."

12. No individual faculty member spent more than 25% of his time on this Project.

13. The difference between the initial Project budget request and the final approved budget amounted to $4,949.

14. The primary initiators of this Project were representatives of Maryland Higher Education Institutions.

15. No alternative sources of federal funds were considered prior to submitting the proposal for consideration by the Title I State Agency.

16. No measures were taken to develop communication with Model Cities Directors in relation to this Project.

17. Two primary mechanisms were developed for the exchange and dissemination of Project materials, reports, and evaluations. These include the scheduling and conducting of Project activities and the development of a comprehensive mailing list including all institutions and organizations within the State of Maryland that provide programs and services of a continuing education or community service nature.

18. While the development of a consortia of institutions was technically not involved in the operation of the Project, the Project was given direction and guidance throughout its entire course by an Advisory Committee composed of representatives of the various types of CS/CE institutions and organizations in the State of Maryland.

19. The experience of working with an Advisory Committee for the purposes indicated above was found to be highly satisfactory and critical to the maintenance of relevance among Project objectives, needs of institutions being served, needs of professional staff, and activities sponsored by the Project.

20. The general pattern of relationships between our institution and community residents in relation to CS/CE Projects may be characterized as "b" "Partners in Problem Solving."

APPENDIX A

Needs Assessment Instrument

and

Survey Results

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
CONFERENCES AND INSTITUTES DIVISION

OFFICE OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

September 19, 1975

Dear Colleague:

The Maryland State Agency for Title I has partially funded the University of Maryland University College Conferences and Institutes Division to administer a statewide project designed to strengthen community services and continuing education (CS/CE) programs in Maryland institutions and organizations. Although the project aims primarily to serve the CS/CE professional within higher educational institutions, adult educators in voluntary organizations, professional associations, business and industry, state and local government agencies, and public schools are also being invited to participate in project planning and activities. That is to say, the project scope and audience have been enlarged in an attempt to reach as many educators who are involved with the planning, development, administration, or delivery of programs for adults, regardless of the type of organization in which that educator works.

One of the primary goals of the project is to provide for the in-service training and development of personnel engaged in community service programs. I am writing to you in pursuit of that goal. In order to provide appropriate and timely training activities which will meet the needs of the CS/CE professional, the project's advisory committee is conducting an information/needs survey. With your cooperation and that of others in the State, the committee will use these data to make important program decisions for the upcoming year.

We request that you complete the enclosed survey and mail it back by September 30, 1975, in the self-addressed, stamped envelope which has been provided. This questionnaire will only take a few minutes of your day, but it will help the committee plan for the entire year.

If you have any questions concerning the project or this survey, please contact:

Mr. David Chittenden, Project Coordinator
Conferences and Institutes Division
University of Maryland University College
University Boulevard at Adelphi Road
College Park, Maryland 20742
(301) 454-5241

On behalf of the Advisory Committee, we would like to take this opportunity to thank you in advance for your help in this effort to improve training activities for those working in community services and continuing education within the State of Maryland.

Sincerely,

David Chittenden

David E. Hartl
Project Director

David Chittenden
Project Coordinator

CENTER OF ADULT EDUCATION, COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND 20742
TELEPHONE: (301) 454-5241

Continuing Education for Adults

THE MARYLAND COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROJECT

INFORMATION SURVEY

September 1975

SECTION A: Please indicate the degree to which each of the subject areas below is important to you as a training concern for your individual job performance or professional development. If an area is of maximum importance to you, circle number 1 on the scale. If you regard an area to be completely unimportant to you in your training or professional development, circle number 5 on the scale. Circle 0 if you have no opinion regarding the area in question.

	No Opinion	Extremely Important				Completely Unimportant
1. Techniques for developing and evaluating specific educational program ideas	0	1	2	3	4	5
2. Techniques for researching and analyzing community needs	0	1	2	3	4	5
3. Principles of small group processes	0	1	2	3	[illegible]	5
4. Skills for organizing and leading discussion in small groups	0	1	2	3	4	5
5. Management of specific program activity budgets	0	1	2	3	4	5
6 Proposal writing and grantsmanship	0	1	2	3	4	5
7 The effective recruiting of program faculty or instructional staff	0	1	2	3	4	5
8 Adults as learners: principles and methods	0	1	2	3	4	5
9. Program planning methods and models	0	1	2	3	4	5
0. Effective long-range program planning and forecasting	0	1	2	3	4	5
1 Instructional techniques for adults	0	1	2	3	4	5
2 Use of P.E.R.T. (Program Evaluation and Review Technique) and other critical path techniques or methods used in educational program management	0	1	2	3	4	5
3 Developing a total promotional strategy for a specific program	0	1	2	3	4	5
Writing and editing promotional copy	0	1	2	3	4	5
Identifying and reaching specific target audiences	0	1	2	3	4	5
Use and application of common resources and references for promotion (e.g., the Direct Mail List Index)	0	1	2	3	4	5

		No Opinion	Extremely Important				Completely Unimportant
17.	Evaluating effectiveness of program promotion	0	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Office administration and supervisory skills	0	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Developing effective management skills	0	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Total educational and service program budget management and financial control	0	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Cost accounting principles and methods	0	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Principles and methods of professional staff development	0	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Fund raising techniques	0	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Managing and directing volunteer resources	0	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Developing effective interviewing skills for staff selection	0	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Future of the community services/continuing education field	0	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Traditional and non-traditional program delivery systems and formats	0	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Current issues in community services and continuing education	0	1	2	3	4	5
29.	Innovative cooperative relationships and linkages between CS/CE organizations (e.g., cooperative sponsorship, sharing mailing lists, program contacts, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5
30.	Implications of current Maryland legislation and legislative proposals for community services/continuing education (e.g, Rosenberg Commission,etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5

31. Please list any other topical areas which have not been included, but that you feel warrant the development of some training activity. Make these additional items as specific as you wish even though you believe they may only apply to a very small group of people.

a. ____

b. ____

c. ____

d. ____

e. ____

32. Of the topical areas you rated as being extremely important (1), please rank, if applicable, the three for which you feel the greatest training urgency or need.

(1) __________ (2) __________ (3) __________

TION B: Because of the variety of individuals to whom this survey is being sent, it would be extremely helpful if you would provide us with some background information concerning your current professional situation. Please check the appropriate response for each of the following items.

For what type of organization or institution do you work?

A. Public College or University:

(1) 2 Year _____

(2) 4 Year _____

B. Private College or University:

(1) 2 Year _____

(2) 4 Year _____

C. Business:

(1) Retail _____

(2) Manufacturing _____

(3) Service _____

D. Public Agency (excluding colleges/universities):

(1) Social Service _____

(2) Health _____

(3) Law Enforcement _____

(4) Recreation _____

(5) Library _____

(6) School System _____

(7) Museum _____

E. Other (Describe):

(1) __________

____

How long have you been in this job?

(1) _____ 0-1 year (2) _____ 1-2 years (3) _____ 2-4 years (4) _____ Over 4 years

In what major field(s) do you hold your highest formal degree?

__________ __________

Please indicate from the list below, or specify in the "other" category, the THREE MAJOR TASKS in your current position in which you spend most of your time, and indicate the approximate percentage of time that you normally spend on each. SPECIFY ONLY THREE AS MAJOR TASKS.

(1) _____ Teaching in Programs _____%

(2) _____ Developing Program Instructional Materials _____%

(3) _____ Program Planning/Development _____%

(4) _____ Program Coordination and Administration _____%

(5) _____ Managing and Directing Staff Resources _____%

(6) _____ General Office Administration _____%

(7) _____ Outside Consultation _____%

(8) _____ Other: __________ _____%

(9) _____ Other: __________ _____%

(10) _____ Other: __________ _____%

ONAL:

Would you be willing to serve on a planning committee for one or more of the training activities or task forces sponsored by the project? _____ Yes _____ No. If so, in what subject or problem areas would you be particularly interested?

____

Name: __________ Address: __________ (Zip)

Telephone:

RESULTS OF THE CS/CE INFORMATION

SURVEY CONDUCTED SEPTEMBER 22-OCTOBER 8, 1975

The CS/CE information survey, after revision by the Advisory Committee, was distributed to a sample of 425 incorporating the following sub-groups.

1. Individuals within higher educational institutions:
    a. 115 from CS/CE mailing list of 1974-75 project participants;
    b. 10 from University of Maryland Cooperative Extension Service;
    c. 12 from Johns Hopkins University and University of Maryland at Baltimore professional schools.
2. Industry/Government Training Directors/Officers:
    a. 35 members from Maryland Chapter of A.S.T.D.;
    b. 6 training officers in Maryland correctional facilities.
3. Educators in private voluntary or non-profit organizations:
    a. 27 staff members of YMCA's of Metropolitan Washington;
    b. 25 staff members of YWCA's of the Greater Baltimore area;
    c. 20 staff members of the Health and Welfare Council of Central Maryland;
    d. 19 executives from independent health associations and foundations;
    e. 5 members of Maryland Hospital Association;
    f. 5 staff members from Opportunities Industrialization Center of Baltimore, Inc.
4. 43 members of the Maryland Recreation and Parks Association.
5. 47 Adult Services Librarians from P.G. and Montgomery counties.
6. 25 health educators from the Health Education Center, State Department of Health and Mental Hygiene.
7. 31 state and local supervisors of Adult Education.

The intent of this total sample was to achieve adequate representation from the variety of groups and audiences that could potentially be served by this project. Strict sampling procedures were not followed although randomization of participant selection was adhered to when partial sub-group mailing lists were used as the basis for sample selection.

Table A below summarizes the survey sample and return rate for the total sample and each sample sub-group. Please note that after the survey was analyzed, another 18 were received bringing the total number of surveys returned to 224 (52.71%).

TABLE A

SURVEY RETURN SCALE FOR TOTAL SAMPLE AND SUB-GROUPS WITHIN SAMPLE

Group	# Surveys Sent	# Surveys Returned	Percentage of Surveys Returned
TOTAL SAMPLE	425	206	48.47%
Higher Education	137	81	59.12%
A.S.T.D.	41	20	48.78%
YWCA-YMCA	52	27	51.92%
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	49	12	24.48%
Recreation & Parks	43	20	46.51%
Libraries	47	17	36.17%
Health Dept. Educ.	25	16	64.00%
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	31	13	41.94%

The survey was divided into two major sections. Section A directed respondents to react to 30 subject areas as to each area's relative importance as a training concern for effective job performance or professional development. Section B attempted to obtain particular job background information about the respondent.

SECTION B

It was found that respondents hold their highest formal degree in 67 different subject fields (ranging from anthropology to zoology). Of the total of 208 degrees held in the 67 cited subject fields, only 5 degrees were held in adult education.

As shown in Table B below, over half (52%)of the total sample have been in their current job for over 4 years and 71% have been in their current position over 2 years.

TABLE B

NUMBER OF YEARS SURVEY RESPONDENTS HAVE BEEN IN CURRENT JOBS

FOR TOTAL SAMPLE AND SUB-GROUPS

	0-1* Years		1-2 Years		2-4 Years		Over 4 Years	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
TOTAL GROUP	25	25%	33	16.5%	38	19%	104	52%
Higher Education	4	5.33%	13	17.33%	19	25.33%	39	52%
A.S.T.D.	3	15%	5	25%	3	15%	9	45%
YMCA - YWCA	7	25.92%	7	25.93	5	18.52%	8	29.63%
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	1	8.33%	1	8.33%	2	16.67%	8	66.67%
Recreation & Parks	2	10%	1	5%	3	15%	14	70%
Libraries	4	23.53%	3	17.65%	0	0	10	58.82%
Health Dept. Educ.	4	25%	2	13%	4	25%	6	37%
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	0	0	1	7.69%	2	15.38%	10	76.92%

* 26 non-responses

The three major tasks in which most respondents spend the greatest amount of time are: (1) program planning/development [157 out of 208]; (2) program coordination and administration [140 out of 206]; (3) managing and directing staff resources [103 out of 206]. There appeared to be relative uniformity of this response pattern across the different sample sub-groups as can be seen in Table C on page 5.

Of the 206 surveys returned, 73 respondents indicated a willingness to serve on a planning committee for one or more of the training activities or task forces sponsored by the project. The breakdown by sub-group is provided in Table D below.

TABLE D

H.E.I.	27
A.E. Supervisors	3
A.S.T.D.	11
Libraries	5
YWCA-YMCA	10
Recreation & Parks	8
Health Dept. Educ.	6
Independent Health Organizations	3
TOTAL	73

TABLE C

JOR TA

Major Tasks		Total Group	H.E.I.	A.S.T.D.	YWCA-YMCA	Ind. Health & Welfare	Rec. & Parks	Libraries	Health Dept. Educ.	Local & State A.E. Supervisors
Teaching in Programs	N	43	20	8	7	0	2	3	3	0
	M%	28.85%	34.41%	20.71%	27.85%		20%	23.37%	30%	
Developing Program Instructional Materials	N	17	8	3	2	2	0	1	0	0
	M%	23%	16.25%	20%	22.50%	55%		20%		
Program Planning/ Development	N	157	61	14	24	8	14	9	15	12
	M%	28.65%	29.66%	33.84%	28.91%	27.85%	30%	22%	37.35%	25.5%
Program Coordination and Administration	N	146	54	10	19	9	17	10	14	13
	M%	35.40%	37.29%	32%	35.55%	45.62%	36.50%	36%	37.9%	43%
Managing and Directing Staff Resources	N	103	42	9	12	5	14	12	6	3
	M%	30.02%	29.81%	33.88%	26.25%	32%	28.46%	36.18%	19.67%	29%
General Office Administration	N	69	29	5	6	4	7	6	3	9
	M%	31.21%	30.03%	41%	31.67%	21.66%	39.28%	30%	15%	30%
Outside Consultation	N	16	4	5	1	1	1	0	4	0
	M%	20.33%	16.67%	30%	15%	20%	10%		15%	
Other: Counseling	N	5	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
	M%	36%	40.00%	20%	40%					
Other: Public Relations	N	5	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	0
	M%	25.6%		35%		21%		30%		
Other: Proposal Writing	N	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0
	M%	23.75%			25%				20%	
Other:	N									
	M%									
Other:	N									
	M%									

N = number of respondents citing a particular task
M% = mean or average percentage of time the group of respondents spend on each task

SECTION A.

Each of the 30 items was analyzed for total group and sub-group mean response on the 1-5 scale of importance. In order to provide a general indication of the type or shape of response distribution for a given item, the mid-point response in the range of responses was calculated. The analysis for the individual items 1-30 is included in Appendix 1. All subject area items were ranked from 1-30 based upon the mean response for each item. The ranking of subject areas from most important (#1) to least important (#30) is provided in Table E on pages 7 and 8. Items which had identical means were treated as having identical rank.

Because of the likelihood of respondents marking numerous items as #1 in importance, it was felt that some method should be provided for further differentiating between those items marked #1. Accordingly, respondents were requested to examine those items they marked #1 in importance, to select the three most important, and to rank them according to the greatest training urgency or need.

Of these three #1 items cited, three points were assigned to the item ranked #1, two points to the item ranked #2, and one point to the item ranked #3. In this fashion, the items ranking highest in this select group received the greatest number of points; the items ranking lowest received the lowest number of points. The overall ranking of these selected subject areas rated #1 in importance is shown in Table F on pages 9 and 10.

TABLE E

RANKING OF SUBJECT AREAS

R = [illegible] of [illegible]je[illegible]rea[illegible]thi[illegible]b-g

m = mean response for subject area

RANK	TOTAL SAMPLE RANKING	(m)	H.E.I.		ASTD		YWCA-YMCA		Ind. Health		Rec.& Parks		Li-braries		Health De.Ed.		A.E. Super.	
			R	(m)	R	(m)	R	(m)	R	(m)	R	(m)	R	(m)	R	(m)	R	(m)
1.	Techniques for researching and analyzing community needs.	1.69	1	1.66	24	3.05	1	1.38	3	2.00	2	1.35	1	1.63	1	1.25	1	1.46
2.	Effective long-range program planning and forecasting	1.80	3	1.81	5	2.65	3	1.58	1	1.50	7	1.75	3	1.69	6	1.94	6	2.08
3.	Developing effective management skills	1.94	8	2.16	1	1.50	6	1.69	4	2.08	1	1.25	2	1.65	12	2.07	26	3.08
4.	Techniques for developing and evaluating specific educational program ideas	1.98	2	1.75	4	1.94	16	1.95	6	2.01	28	2.88	16	2.64	1	1.25	5	2.00
5.	Program planning methods and models	2.05	9	2.22	10	2.21	4	1.67	8	2.17	12	2.00	5	1.88	3	1.75	9	2.17
6.	Implications of current Md. legislation and legislative proposals for CS/CE	2.09	6	2.10	19	2.79	10	1.86	9	2.18	11	1.94	12	2.19	5	1.81	2	1.67
7.	Identifying and reaching specific target audiences	2.10	5	2.04	15	2.56	8	1.77	15	2.50	15	2.16	4	1.81	10	2.06	11	2.38
8.	Principles and methods of professional staff development	2.16	15	2.32	9	2.05	12	1.88	21	2.64	4	1.53	7	2.06	13	2.13	19	2.75
9.	Evaluating effectiveness of program promotion	2.17	4	2.01	20	2.85	19	2.04	17	2.42	12	2.00	7	2.06	15	2.19	12	2.50
0.	Proposal writing and grantsmanship	2.20	13	2.28	16	2.59	6	1.69	2	1.83	9	1.80	19	2.76	3	1.75	22	3.00
1.	Management of specific program activity budgets	2.26	18	2.35	12	2.41	9	1.81	4	2.08	6	1.70	22	2.94	17	2.25	17	2.63
2.	Developing a total promotional strategy for a specific program	2.27	9	2.22	18	2.61	23	2.24	12	2.30	13	2.21	11	2.13	13	2.13	16	2.58
13.	Traditional and non-traditional program delivery systems and formats	2.29	7	2.15	17	2.60	11	1.87	6	2.09	25	2.53	15	2.53	20	2.50	18	[illegible]
14.	Total educational and service program budget management and financial control	2.33	19	2.42	11	2.25	21	2.15	13	2.42	10	1.84	20	2.87	15	2.19	15	2.55
14.	Principles of small group processes	2.33	27	2.89	5	2.05	15	1.92	24	2.82	18	2.25	17	2.67	8	2.00	20	2.83
16.	Office administration and supervisory skills	2.35	22	2.56	5	2.05	22	2.19	18	2.58	-2	1.35	10	2.12	25	2.75	22	3.00
17.	Adults as learners: principles and methods	2.37	11	2.24	3	1.89	28	2.75	26	2.90	30	3.06	18	2.73	10	2.06	-3-	1.85
18.	Current issues in community services and continuing education	2.37	12	2.27	23	3.00	17	1.96	17	2.55	27	2.76	23	3.07	19	2.31	4	1.92
19.	Future of the community services/continuing education field	2.39	17	2.34	28	3.21	19	2.04	11	2.25	19	2.31	13	2.25	24	2.73	8	2.15
19.	Innovative cooperative relationships and linkages between CS/CE organizations	2.39	14	2.30	26	3.17	14	1.91	27	3.00	20	2.44	6	1.94	21	2.53	12	2.50

RANKING OF SUBJECT AREAS

ANK	TOTAL SAMPLE RANKING	(m)	H.E.I.		ASTD		YWCA-YMCA		Ind. Health		Rec. & Parks		Li-braries		Health De.Ed.		A.E. Super.	
			R	(m)	R	(m)	R	(m)	R	(m)	R	(m)	R	(m)	R	(m)	R	(m)
1.	Instructional techniques for adults	2.45	15	2.32	2	1.78	27	2.73	28	3.18	29	2.94	25	3.13	9	2.00	6	2.08
2.	Skills for organizing and leading discussion in small groups	2.47	25	2.77	5	2.05	12	1.88	22	2.67	22	2.45	14	2.44	6	1.94	22	3.00
3.	Use of P.E.R.T. and other critical path techniques or methods used in educ. program management	2.56	21	2.55	13	2.53	25	2.48	9	2.18	26	2.58	26	3.23	17	2.25	21	2.91
4.	Developing effective interviewing skills for staff selection.	2.59	28	2.94	13	2.53	17	1.96	29	3.25	5	1.65	7	2.06	28	3.13	27	3.15
1.	The effective recruiting of program faculty or instructional staff	2.59	20	2.46	21	2.89	24	2.33	18	2.58	16	2.17	29	3.94	22	2.67	10	2.23
5.	Use and application of common resources and references for promotion	2.74	23	2.61	25	3.13	26	2.54	29	3.25	20	2.44	23	3.07	27	3.06	12	2.50
7.	Writing and editing promotional copy	2.81	24	2.72	21	2.89	30	2.80	25	2.83	23	2.50	21	2.88	29	3.38	22	3.00
3.	Cost accounting principles and methods	2.91	26	2.84	27	3.19	29	2.76	23	2.75	23	2.50	28	3.76	23	2.69	28	3.30
).	Managing and directing volunteer resources	2.94	29	3.30	29	4.29	2	1.55	18	2.58	8	1.79	27	3.24	26	3.00	29	3.58
).	Fund raising techniques	3.19	30	3.39	30	4.35	4	1.63	15	2.50	14	2.12	30	4.13	30	3.73	30	4.08

TABLE F

RANKING OF SELECTED SUBJECT AREAS RATED 1 IN IMPORTANCE

R = rank of subject area within sub-group

RANK	TOTAL SAMPLE RANKING	Points	H.E.I.		ASTD		YWCA-YMCA		Ind. Health		Rec.& Parks		Libraries		Health De.Ed.		A.E. Super.	
			R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P
1.	Techniques for researching and analyzing community needs	119	1	40	14	2	1	25	3	4	1	18	2	13	3	7	1	10
2.	Effective long-range program planning and forecasting	86	3	29	9	4	2	20	4	3	3	15	10	2	5	6	3	7
3.	Developing effective management skills	71	8	13	1	11	6	8	4	3	1	18	1	14	12	2	12	2
4.	Technqiues for developing and evaluating specific educational program ideas	70	2	32	2	8	13	3	1	8	16	1			1	11	3	7
5.	Proposal writing and grantsmanship	59	5	17	2	8	3	15	4	3	5	7		0	2	9		0
6.	Program planning methods and models	42	13	11	5	7	9	6	10	2		0	4	6	3	7	7	3
7.	Identifying and reaching specific target audiences	39	5	17		0	4	14		0	13	2	4	6		0		0
8.	Developing a total promotional strategy for a specific program	34	4	21		0	13	3	4	3		0		0	9	4	7	3
9.	Principles and methods of professional staff development	29	28	1	7	5	7	7		0	5	7	3	7	12	2		0
10.	Management of specific program activity budgets	28	13	11	10	3	5	10	15	1		0	8	3		0		0
11.	Total educationalaand service program budget management and financial control	25	18	8	6	6	22	1	2	5	16	1		0	9	4		0
12.	Innovative cooperative relationships and linkages between CS/CE organizations	24	15	10		0	7	7		0	13	2	10	2	11	3		0
12.	Office administration and supervisory skills	24	19	6	17	1	22	1		0	4	11	6	5		0		0
12,	Traditional and non-traditional program delivery systems and formats	24	8	13	10	3	11	4	10	2		0		0	12	2		0
15.	Instructional techniques for adults	22	11	12	2	8		0		0		0		0		0	12	2
16.	Managing and directing volunteer resources	21	16	9		0	18	2	10	2	5	7		0		0	17	1
16.	Future of the community services/continuing education field	21	11	12		0	13	3		0	16	1	10	2		0	7	3
16.	Implications of current Maryland legislation and leg. proposals for CS/CE	21	7	15		0	13	3		0	10	3		0		0		0
19.	The effective recruiting of program faculty or instructional staff	20	24	3		0	13	3	10	2	8	6	10	2		0	6	4
19.	Adults as learners: principles and methods	20	8	13	14	2		0	10	2		0		0		0	7	3

RANKING OF SELECTED SUBJECT AREAS RATED 1 IN IMPORTANCE

	TOTAL SAMPLE RANKING	Points	H.E.I.		ASTD		YWCA-YMCA		Ind. Health		Rec.& Parks		Li-braries		Health De.Ed.		A.E. Super.	
			R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P
21.	Current issues in community services and continuing education	19	22	9		0	22	1		0		0	8	3	16	1	5	5
22.	Developing effective interviewing skills for staff selection	18		0	10	3		0	4	3	8	6	7	4		0	12	2
23.	Principles of small group processes	15		0	7	5	10	5		0		0		0	6	5		0
23.	Evaluating effectiveness of program promotion	15	24	3		0	18	2	15	1	10	3	14	1	6	5		0
25.	Skills for organizing and leading discussion in small groups	13	27	2	14	2	12	4		0		0		0	6	5		0
25.	Fund raising techniques	13	20	5		0	22	1	4	3	16	1		0		0	7	3
27.	Use and application of common resources and references for promotion(e.g. Direct Mail List)	12	24	3	10	3	18	2		0	13	2		0	12	2		0
28.	Use of P.E.R.T. and other critical path techniques or methods used in educ. program management	9	21	4	17	1		0		0	10	3		0	16	1		0
29.	Writing and editing promotional copy	7	21	4		0		0		0		0	14	1		0	12	2
30.	Cost accounting principles and methods	6	21	4		0	18	2		0		0		0		0		0

DISCUSSION

Every good discussion section includes at least one disclaimer cautioning one on the interpretation of results. Therefore:

DISCLAIMER

STATISTICAL TESTS FOR DETERMINING SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEANS WERE NOT MADE, THEREFORE, JUMP CAUTIOUSLY TOWARD ANY CONCLUSION.

With this disclaimer made, there appears to be ample and interesting data from which to make some programming decisions.

1. Responses to Section B appear to describe a homogeneous group of professionals in a variety of organizational or institutional settings. This group of respondents is well seasoned (52% in current job over four years, 71% over two years). Not only is this group similar in terms of length of service in current job, but also in the major job tasks in which they spend most of their time.

   It is also abundantly clear that just as homogeneous as this group is in the above characteristics, they are just the opposite when it comes to the major field in which they earned their highest formal degree. It appears that all spokes on the academic wheel are represented in this group of professionals.

Implications

a. Because of the commonality of major job tasks across the group of respondents, it would appear that most respondents would be able to relate to training programs touching upon some aspect of the three major job tasks. That is, we are verifying an assumption that we have made: that professionals in a wide variety of organizations are performing similar tasks and most likely share common training needs.

b. Perhaps one implication of the considerable length of time most of these respondents have been in their current jobs is that one could "trust" or "believe" their responses across the subject areas more than one could "trust" those responses from individuals new to their jobs. Of course, the assumption underlying this implication is that someone who has been in a particular job for a longer period of time is more apt to understand clearly those subject areas "crucial" to job performance or professional development. Unfortunately, because of time limitations, it was not possible to determine the difference, if any, in response patterns on Section A of the survey as a function of time in current job.

2. Responses to Section A: Both the "Ranking of Subject Areas" and the "Ranking of Selected Subject Areas Rated 1 in Importance," showed remarkable uniformity with only several exceptions. (#30 fell from 6th place to 16th, and #6 went from 10th place to 5th place.) Both rankings demonstrated similar ranking of the subject areas for the total group. This should lend more confidence to whatever programming decisions are made based upon the expressed interest in each of the given subject areas - certainly the greatest confidence should be placed in decisions about subject areas which were at either end of the ranking range where mean differences are greatest.

Clustering specific subject areas in terms of categories of subjects provides additional information on the expressed needs of the respondents. In Table G below it is apparent that those specific subject areas dealing with the general category of program planning and development had the lowest set of means and ranks for any cluster of items. Such clusters should also provide some content and emphasis guidance to subsequent program planning committees.

TABLE G

BROAD CATEGORIES OF SUBJECT AREAS

Program Development

Item #	Rank	Mean
1	4	1.98
2	1	1.69
9	5	2.05
10	2	1.80
6	10	2.20

Small Group Processes

Item #	Rank	Mean
3	14	2.33
4	22	2.77

Program Admin. (Budget)

Item #	Rank	Mean
5	11	2.26
20	14	2.33
21	21	2.91

Management Functions

Item #	Rank	Mean
18	16	2.35
19	3	1.94
22	8	2.16
25	24	2.59

Promotion

Item #	Rank	Mean
13	12	2.27
14	27	2.81
15	7	2.10
16	26	2.74
17	9	2.17

General Issues for CS/CE

Item #	Rank	Mean
26	19	2.39
27	13	2.29
28	17	2.37
29	19	2.39
30	6	2.09

Program Admin. (Program Tasks)

Item #	Rank	Mean
7	24	2.59
12	23	2.56

Adult as Learner: Theory & Techniques

Item #	Rank	Mean
8	17	2.37
11	21	2.45

Item #31. Please list any other topical areas which have not been included, but that you feel warrant the development of some training activity. Make these additional items as specific as you wish even though you believe they may only apply to a very small group of people.

ASTD

1. assessment centers as a management selection process.

2. evaluation of training effectiveness - short and long range - particularly in the training of supervisors and managers.

3. individual roles in improving quality of life - e.g., health, safety, security.

4. communications programs - verbal, written, etc.

5. writing individualized education programs using various media,including programmed instruction.

A.E. Supervisors

1. recruitment of functional illiterates for ABE classes.

2. testing services for adults.

3. adult psychology.

4. inter-personal relationships.

5. training of supporting services staff (custodians, secretaries) toward cooperating agencies.

6. the most critical single factor to me is one you cannot deal with. We,in smaller systems,have no person to be provided with in-service. I am the only supervisor of science, math, health, environmental ed. in my system and also single-handedly ran an adult program that serves over 2,000 adults each year. I have no time to attend meetings.

7. traditional versus non-traditional means nothing; it changes in each locality. local programs are most important - not state directed programs. More local authority to meet their own needs - less state direction.

Independent Health and Welfare Groups

1. training in public relations, community awareness.

2. recruitment: training of competent minorities.

Health Department Educators

1. Survey design.
2. consultation skills.
3. development of innovative and motivational educational exhibits.
4. analysis of symbiotic and synergistic relationships between public, voluntary, and private sector organizations.
5. behavioral and psychological blocks to communications.
6. training techniques and methodology for unskilled persons.
7. community organization.
8. contract writing and agreements between consumer and provider.

Recreation and Parks

1. Financial development - the total picture.
2. developing a philosophy of leisure for every person.
3. developing education strategy for teaching the attitudes and skills of leisure.
4. state services to community.
5. public relations skills.
6. most effective means of equipment and materials purchasing as related to projected need and budget availability.

YMCA/YWCA

1. model for staff communications.
2. supervision.
3. staff relations.
4. how educators and professional staff relate to volunteers and paraprofessionals.
5. how to deal with the oppressed masses. evaluation of the ontological effects of program. making program fit or address itself to the concrete existential situation. an analysis of the effects of racism as a modern day phenomenon. education for the oppressed.
6. on-going coordination of community agencies towards providing effective services: (reduction of competition and duplication). (a) adolescent non-traditional programs - outreach, conferences at camps; (b) recreation dept., comm. school councils YMCA's, Boys Clubs, YWCA's, Community Colleges, etc.

YMCA-YWCA (con't)

7. clearing house to understand what agencies offer to lay collaboration efforts.

Libraries

1. developing skills in working with reaching members of the community, particularly teenagers.
2. training supervisors to train.
3. management by objectives.
4. primary is reasonable prices for attendees.

HEI

1. program planning - professional ed.
2. implementing affirmative action programs.
3. handling personnel problems.
4. since we deal with business and industry, we find it extremely important:
   (a) have personal contact with bu. and ind. representatives;
   (b) have qualified instructor with practical business experience;
   (c) maintain close liaison and follow up of programs;
   (d) evaluations (written) by seminar participants to help us improve program, instruction, material, etc.
5. professional continuing education.
6. organizing and evaluating the continuing education office/division/department.
7. interface with art therapy and voc. rehab.
8. individualized instruction. student evaluation of instruction. counseling of adults. developmental concepts. reading instruction.
9. techniques for including counseling and/or guiding adult learners into programs.
10. managing use of facilities and material resources for programs.
11. involvement of adult learners in planning and evaluation of programs.
12. evaluation of program effectiveness.
13. developing file systems for CEU courses.
14. career development for individuals: direction finding, planning, job finding skills - (note: because college placement programs do an uneven job and too many undergraduates decide too late that they need what is offered, most do not get what they actually need [recent college graduates]).

HEI (con't)

15. improved communications between CS/CE organizations.

16. effective recruitment of minority staff techniques.

17. workshops for newly elected legislators.

APPENDIX I

1. Techniques for developing and evaluating specific educational program ideas.

				RAW RESPONSES					
GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	1.98	2	23	84	40	42	13	4
Higher Education	81	1.75	1	8	38	17	16	2	0
A.S.T.D.	20	1.94	2	1	8	5	5	1	0
YMCA - YWCA	27	1.95	2	6	8	7	5	1	0
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.09	2	1	6	1	1	3	0
Recreation & Parks	20	2.88	3	3	1	3	8	4	1
Libraries	17	2.64	3	3	4	3	3	2	2
Health Dept. Educ.	16	1.25	1	0	13	2	1	0	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	2.00	2	1	6	2	3	0	1

2. Techniques for researching and analyzing community needs.

				RAW RESPONSES					
GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	1.69	1	15	114	39	27	6	5
Higher Education	81	1.66	1	10	42	14	13	1	1
A.S.T.D.	20	3.05	3	3	3	3	5	2	4
YMCA-YWCA	27	1.38	1	1	19	5	1	1	0
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.00	2	0	5	4	1	2	0
Recreation & Parks	20	1.35	1	0	15	3	2	0	0
Libraries	17	1.63	1	1	9	4	3	0	0
Health Dept. Educ.	16	1.25	1	0	13	2	1	0	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	1.46	1	0	8	4	1	0	0

3. Principles of small group processes.

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES 0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.33	2	14	45	47	63	30	7
Higher Education	81	2.89	3	7	12	12	27	18	5
A.S.T.D.	20	2.05	2	1	6	7	5	1	0
YMCA - YWCA	27	1.92	2	2	12	5	6	2	0
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.82	3	1	1	4	3	2	1
Recreation & Parks	20	2.25	2	0	3	10	6	1	0
Libraries	17	2.67	3	2	3	1	9	2	0
Health Dept. Educ.	16	2.00	2	0	7	4	3	2	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	2.83	3	1	1	4	4	2	1

4. Skills for organizing and leading discussion in small groups.

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES 0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.47	2	6	52	53	55	29	11
Higher Education	81	2.77	3	0	19	12	25	19	6
A.S.T.D.	20	2.05	2	2	4	10	3	1	0
YMCA - YWCA	27	1.88	2	1	12	7	5	2	0
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.67	2	0	2	5	2	1	2
Recreation & Parks	20	2.45	2	0	2	10	6	1	1
Libraries	17	2.44	3	1	4	3	8	0	1
Health Dept. Educ.	16	1.94	2	0	8	3	3	2	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	3.0	3	2	1	3	3	3	1

5. Management of specific program activity budgets.

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES					
				0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.26	2	12	66	51	47	21	9
Higher Education	81	2.35	2	7	27	16	14	12	5
A.S.T.D.	20	2.41	2	3	3	6	6	2	0
YMCA - YWCA	27	1.81	2	0	13	9	3	1	1
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.08	2	0	4	4	3	1	0
Recreation & Parks	20	1.7	1	0	11	5	3	1	0
Libraries	17	2.94	3	0	3	3	6	2	3
Health Dept. Educ.	16	2.25	2	0	3	6	7	0	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	2.63	3	2	2	2	5	2	0

6. Proposal writing and grantsmanship.

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES					
				0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.20	2	7	80	42	45	22	10
Higher Education	81	2.28	2	2	28	21	15	10	5
A.S.T.D.	20	2.59	3	3	5	3	5	2	2
YMCA - YWCA	27	1.69	1	1	16	3	6	1	0
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	1.83	2	0	6	3	2	1	0
Recreation & Parks	20	1.8	1	0	11	4	3	2	0
Libraries	17	2.76	3	0	4	2	7	2	2
Health Dept. Educ.	16	1.75	2	0	8	5	2	1	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	3.0	3	1	2	1	5	3	1

7. The effective recruiting of program faculty or instructional staff.

				RAW RESPONSES					
GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.59	3	13	52	44	48	30	19
Higher Education	81	2.46	2	7	22	19	15	13	5
A.S.T.D.	20	2.89	3	2	3	3	6	5	1
YMCA - YWCA	27	2.33	3	0	9	4	10	4	0
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.58	3	0	4	2	2	3	1
Recreation & Parks	20	2.17	2	2	5	7	4	2	0
Libraries	17	3.94	5	1	2	0	4	1	9
Health Dept. Educ.	16	2.67	3	1	2	5	6	0	2
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	2.23	2	0	5	4	1	2	1

8. Adults as learners: principles and methods.

				RAW RESPONSES					
GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.37	2	15	49	57	58	19	8
Higher Education	81	2.24	2	2	21	30	19	6	3
A.S.T.D.	20	1.89	2	1	8	5	6	0	0
YMCA - YWCA	27	2.75	3	3	4	5	9	5	1
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.90	3	2	2	2	2	3	1
Recreation & Parks	20	3.06	3	4	0	3	10	2	1
Libraries	17	2.73	3	2	3	4	4	2	2
Health Dept. Educ.	16	2.06	2	1	6	3	5	1	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	1.85	2	0	5	5	3	0	0

9. Program planning methods and models.

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES					
				0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.05	2	9	69	66	46	15	1
Higher Education	81	2.22	2	5	21	25	22	8	0
A.S.T.D.	20	2.21	3	1	6	3	10	0	0
YMCA - YWCA	27	1.67	1	0	15	8	2	2	0
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.17	2	0	2	7	2	1	0
Recreation & Parks	20	2.0	2	1	6	9	2	2	0
Libraries	17	1.88	2	1	8	4	3	0	1
Health Dept. Educ.	16	1.75	1	0	9	3	3	1	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	2.17	2	1	2	7	2	1	0

10. Effective long-range program planning and forecasting.

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES					
				0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	1.80	2	6	92	68	29	11	0
Higher Education	81	1.81	2	3	33	29	14	2	0
A.S.T.D.	20	2.05	2	1	8	5	3	3	0
YMCA - YWCA	27	1.58	1	1	14	9	3	0	0
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	1.5	1	0	7	4	1	0	0
Recreation & Parks	20	1.75	2	0	10	6	3	1	0
Libraries	17	1.69	1	1	10	3	1	2	0
Health Dept. Educ.	16	1.94	2	0	7	5	2	2	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	2.08	2	0	3	7	2	1	0

11. Instructional techniques for adults.

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES 0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.45	2	11	46	60	53	27	9
Higher Education	81	2.32	2	3	21	27	17	9	4
A.S.T.D.	20	1.78	1	1	10	4	4	1	0
YMCA - YWCA	27	2.73	3	1	4	7	8	6	1
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	3.18	3	1	0	4	2	4	1
Recreation & Parks	20	2.94	3	3	1	4	8	2	1
Libraries	17	3.13	3	2	1	3	6	3	2
Health Dept. Educ.	16	2.0	2	0	6	5	4	1	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	2.08	2	0	3	6	4	0	0

12. Use of P.E.R.T. (program evaluation and review technique) and other critical path techniques or methods used in educational program management.

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES 0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.56	3	16	42	53	57	22	16
Higher Education	81	2.55	2	5	14	25	24	7	6
A.S.T.D.	20	2.53	3	1	6	2	7	3	1
YMCA - YWCA	27	2.48	2	2	7	6	7	3	2
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.18	2	1	4	2	4	1	0
Recreation & Parks	20	2.58	2	1	4	7	4	1	3
Libraries	17	3.23	3	4	2	2	4	1	4
Health Dept. Educ.	16	2.25	2	0	4	7	2	3	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	2.91	3	2	1	2	5	3	0

13. Developing a total promotional strategy for a specific program.

				RAW RESPONSES					
GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.27	2	11	60	63	41	22	9
Higher Education	81	2.22	2	2	27	22	18	10	2
A.S.T.D.	20	2.61	2	2	2	10	2	1	3
YMCA - YWCA	27	2.24	2	2	8	9	4	2	2
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.30	2	2	3	4	1	1	1
Recreation & Parks	20	2.21	2	1	5	7	5	2	0
Libraries	17	2.13	2	1	7	2	5	2	0
Health Dept. Educ.	16	2.13	2	0	6	5	3	1	1
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	2.58	3	1	2	4	3	3	0

14. Writing and editing promotional copy.

				RAW RESPONSES					
GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.81	3	7	35	46	62	33	23
Higher Education	81	2.72	3	2	13	22	25	12	7
A.S.T.D.	20	2.89	3	2	2	5	7	1	3
YMCA - YWCA	27	2.8	3	2	4	7	8	2	4
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.83	3	0	3	3	1	3	2
Recreation & Parks	20	2.50	3	0	6	3	6	5	0
Libraries	17	2.88	3	1	4	2	5	2	3
Health Dept. Educ.	16	3.38	4	0	2	0	6	6	2
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	3.0	3	0	1	4	4	2	2

15. Identifying and reaching specific target audiences.

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES 0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.10	2	7	72	61	46	15	5
Higher Education	81	204	2	2	32	20	20	6	1
A.S.T.D.	20	2.56	2	2	3	7	5	1	2
YMCA - YWCA	27	1.77	1	1	14	7	3	1	1
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.5	3	0	3	3	3	3	0
Recreation & Parks	20	2.16	2	1	5	9	3	1	1
Libraries	17	1.81	2	1	8	4	3	1	0
Health Dept. Educ.	16	2.06	2	0	6	5	3	2	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	2.38	2	0	1	6	6	0	0

16. Use and application of common resources and references for promotion (e.g., the Direct Mail List Index).

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES 0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.74	3	17	36	40	67	30	16
Higher Education	81	2.61	3	5	16	20	23	12	5
A.S.T.D.	20	3.13	4	4	4	1	3	5	3
YMCA - YWCA	27	2.54	3	1	6	5	11	3	1
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	3.25	3	0	0	4	3	3	2
Recreation & Parks	20	2.44	3	2	4	4	8	2	0
Libraries	17	3.07	3	2	3	1	7	0	4
Health Dept. Educ.	16	3.06	3	0	1	3	7	4	1
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	2.50	3	3	2	2	5	1	0

17. Evaluating effectiveness of program promotion.

				RAW RESPONSES					
GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.17	2	8	63	66	45	20	4
Higher Education	81	2.01	2	7	27	26	15	5	1
A.S.T.D.	20	2.85	3	0	3	5	6	4	2
YMCA - YWCA	27	2.04	2	0	9	9	8	1	0
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.42	2	0	2	5	3	2	0
Recreation & Parks	20	2.0	2	0	8	5	6	1	0
Libraries	17	2.06	2	0	4	8	5	0	0
Health Dept. Educ.	16	2.19	2	0	8	3	0	4	1
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	2.5	2	1	2	5	2	3	0

18. Office administration and supervisory skills.

				RAW RESPONSES					
GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.35	2	7	65	50	44	30	10
Higher Education	81	2.56	2	6	22	18	13	15	7
A.S.T.D.	20	2.05	2	0	6	8	5	1	0
YMCA - YWCA	27	2.19	2	1	8	7	9	2	0
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.58	3	0	2	4	4	1	1
Recreation & Parks	20	1.35	1	0	14	5	1	0	0
Libraries	17	2.12	1	0	9	1	4	2	1
Health Dept. Educ.	16	2.75	3	0	2	4	6	4	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	3.0	3	0	2	3	2	5	1

19. Developing effective management skills.

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES 0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	1.94	2	8	95	48	34	13	8
Higher Education	81	2.16	2	6	31	18	15	5	6
A.S.T.D.	20	1.5	1	0	13	4	3	0	0
YMCA - YWCA	27	1.69	1	1	14	7	4	1	0
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.08	2	0	4	5	2	0	1
Recreation & Parks	20	1.25	1	0	15	5	0	0	0
Libraries	17	1.65	1	0	12	2	1	1	1
Health Dept. Educ.	16	2.07	2	1	5	4	6	0	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	3.08	3	0	1	3	3	6	0

20. Total educational and service program budget management and financial control.

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES 0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.33	2	17	58	48	52	24	7
Higher Education	81	2.42	2	8	24	14	20	10	5
A.S.T.D.	20	2.25	2	4	4	6	4	2	0
YMCA - YWCA	27	2.15	2	0	9	8	7	3	0
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.42	2	0	4	3	2	2	1
Recreation & Parks	20	1.84	2	1	6	10	3	0	0
Libraries	17	2.87	3	2	3	2	5	4	1
Health Dept. Educ.	16	2.19	2	0	6	3	5	2	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	2.55	3	2	2	2	6	1	0

21. Cost accounting principles and methods.

				RAW RESPONSES					
GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.91	3	18	30	42	52	42	22
Higher Education	81	2.84	3	7	13	21	15	15	10
A.S.T.D.	20	3.19	3	4	2	1	6	6	1
YMCA - YWCA	27	2.76	3	2	6	5	6	5	3
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.75	3	0	2	4	2	3	1
Recreation & Parks	20	2.50	3	2	3	4	10	1	0
Libraries	17	3.76	4	0	1	3	1	6	6
Health Dept. Educ.	16	2.69	3	0	2	3	9	2	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	3.30	4	3	1	1	3	4	1

22. Principles and methods of professional staff development.

				RAW RESPONSES					
GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.16	2	11	64	64	44	17	6
Higher Education	81	2.32	2	6	18	29	17	8	3
A.S.T.D.	20	2.05	2	1	5	9	4	1	0
YMCA - YWCA	27	1.88	2	1	13	6	4	3	0
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.64	3	1	3	2	3	2	1
Recreation & Parks	20	1.53	1	1	11	6	2	0	0
Libraries	17	2.06	1	0	10	2	1	2	2
Health Dept. Educ.	16	2.13	2	0	4	6	6	0	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	2.75	3	1	0	4	7	1	0

23. Fund raising techniques.

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES 0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	3.19	3	19	32	32	37	40	46
Higher Education	81	3.39	4	10	6	14	14	20	17
A.S.T.D.	20	4.35	5	3	0	1	1	6	9
YMCA - YWCA	27	1.67	1	0	14	9	3	1	0
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.50	3	0	5	1	3	1	2
Recreation & Parks	20	2.12	2	3	6	3	8	0	0
Libraries	17	4.13	5	1	0	1	4	3	8
Health Dept. Educ.	16	3.73	4	1	1	2	1	7	4
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	4.08	5	1	0	1	3	2	6

24. Managing and directing volunteer resources.

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES 0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.94	3	13	40	39	40	41	33
Higher Education	81	3.30	4	8	9	12	15	22	15
A.S.T.D.	20	4.29	5	3	0	0	4	4	9
YMCA - YWCA	27	1.55	1	0	16	7	4	0	0
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.58	3	0	5	1	2	2	2
Recreation & Parks	20	1.79	2	1	6	11	2	0	0
Libraries	17	3.24	3	0	0	6	5	2	4
Health Dept. Educ.	16	3.0	3	0	3	1	6	5	1
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	3.58	4	1	1	1	2	6	2

25. Developing effective interviewing skills for staff selection.

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES 0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.59	2	11	52	47	43	35	18
Higher Education	81	2.94	3	8	12	15	24	12	10
A.S.T.D.	20	2.53	2	1	6	4	3	5	1
YMCA - YWCA	27	1.96	2	1	11	9	3	3	0
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	3.25	4	0	3	1	1	4	3
Recreation & Parks	20	1.65	2	0	9	9	2	0	0
Libraries	17	2.06	2	0	7	5	3	1	1
Health Dept. Educ.	16	3.13	3	1	1	3	4	7	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	3.15	3	0	3	1	3	3	3

26. Future of the community services/continuing education field.

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES 0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.39	2	14	63	40	53	23	13
Higher Education	81	2.34	2	5	28	13	20	11	4
A.S.T.D.	20	3.21	3	1	2	3	7	3	4
YMCA - YWCA	27	2.04	2	2	10	8	4	2	1
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.25	2	0	5	2	3	1	1
Recreation & Parks	20	2.31	2	4	2	8	5	1	0
Libraries	17	2.25	3	1	6	2	7	0	1
Health Dept. Educ.	16	2.73	3	1	5	2	2	4	2
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	2.15	2	0	5	2	5	1	0

27. Traditional and non-traditional program delivery systems and formats.

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES 0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.29	2	17	53	54	60	18	4
Higher Education	81	2.15	2	8	24	20	17	10	0
A.S.T.D.	20	2.6	3	0	4	5	7	3	1
YMCA - YWCA	27	1.87	1	4	13	2	7	0	1
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.09	2	1	4	4	2	0	1
Recreation & Parks	20	2.53	3	1	1	8	9	1	0
Libraries	17	2.53	3	2	1	5	9	0	0
Health Dept. Educ.	16	2.50	3	0	4	3	7	1	1
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	2.17	2	1	0	7	2	3	0

28. Current issues in community services and continuing education.

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES 0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.39	2	12	54	50	61	22	7
Higher Education	81	2.27	2	4	24	20	23	8	2
A.S.T.D.	20	3.0	3	0	4	1	8	5	2
YMCA - YWCA	27	1.96	2	2	11	8	3	2	1
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.55	3	1	2	2	6	1	0
Recreation & Parks	20	2.76	3	3	1	5	8	3	0
Libraries	17	3.07	3	2	2	4	8	0	1
Health Dept. Educ.	16	2.31	2	0	5	5	3	2	1
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	1.92	2	0	5	5	2	1	0

29. Innovative cooperative relationships and linkages between CS/CE organizations (e.g., cooperative sponsorship, sharing mailing lists, program contacts, etc.).

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES 0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.39	2	23	52	51	44	28	8
Higher Education	81	2.30	2	8	22	22	17	9	3
A.S.T.D.	20	3.17	3	2	4	0	6	5	3
YMCA - YWCA	27	1.91	2	5	10	6	5	0	1
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	3.0	3	1	0	3	5	3	0
Recreation & Parks	20	2.44	2	4	4	5	4	2	1
Libraries	17	1.94	2	1	5	8	2	1	0
Health Dept. Educ.	16	2.53	2	1	4	4	2	5	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	2.5	3	1	3	3	3	3	0

30. Implications of current Maryland legislation and legislative proposals for community services/continuing education (e.g., Rosenberg Commission, etc.

GROUP	No.	(m)	Mid-Point	RAW RESPONSES 0	1	2	3	4	5
Total Group	206	2.09	2	22	67	60	35	18	4
Higher Education	81	210	2	9	28	21	13	8	2
A.S.T.D.	20	2.79	3	1	3	5	6	3	2
YMCA - YWCA	27	1.86	2	5	9	9	2	2	0
Independent Health & Welfare Groups	12	2.18	2	1	4	4	0	3	0
Recreation & Parks	20	1.94	2	4	5	7	4	0	0
Libraries	17	2.19	2	1	5	5	4	2	0
Health Dept. Educ.	16	1.81	2	0	7	5	4	0	0
Local and State A.E. Supervisors	13	1.67	2	1	6	4	2	0	0

APPENDIX B

Program Planning Committee

Rosters

MARYLAND COMMUNITY SERVICES/CONTINUING EDUCATION PROJECT

Roster

Management Program Planning Committee

Chairperson

Dr. Bette Coplan, Director of
Research for Continuing Education
University of Maryland
University College
College Park, Maryland 20742

Members

Mr. Howard Caplan, Assoc. Professor
Political Science
Catonsville Community College
Catonsville, Maryland 21228

Ms. Jane T. Christie
Associate Executive Director for
Programs
YWCA
128 W. Franklin Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Mr. Robert Critchlow
Catonsville Community College
Catonsville, Maryland 21228

Mr. Jim Hughes
Commercial Credit Company
300 St. Paul Place
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Ms. Barbara Manchak
Director of Reader Services
Milton S. Eisenhower Library
Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Ms. Rebekah Weir
P.G. County Memorial Library
6532 Adelphi Road
Hyattsville, Maryland 20782

Ms. Mary Wells
Maryland National Capitol Park & Planning Comm
6600 Kenilworth Avenue
Riverdale, Maryland 20840

Ms. Joan Wolle, Director
Health Education Center
Md. State Dept. of Health and
Mental Hygiene
201 W. Preston Street
Baltimore, Md. 21201

MARYLAND COMMUNITY SERVICES/CONTINUING EDUCATION PROJECT

Roster

Program Development Program Planning Committee

Chairperson

Dr. Gerald C. Hanberry, Director
Community Development and Special Projects
Prince Georges Community College
Largo, Maryland 20870

Members

Ms. Nola Arnold
Montgomery College
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Ms. Linda Carman
2103 Glenallen Avenue #201
Silver Spring, Maryland 20906

Ms. Beth W. Kellam
Maryland Hospital Education Institute
1301 York Road
Lutherville, Maryland 21093

Mr. Steve (Mac) McCormick
YMCA
9800 Hastings Drive
Silver Spring, Maryland 20901

Dr. Harold O. Schaffer, Director
Continuing Education
Salisbury State College
Salisbury, Maryland 21801

Mr. Ernst Selig
523 Harwood Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21212

MARYLAND COMMUNITY SERVICES/CONTINUING EDUCATION PROJECT

Roster

Promotion Program Planning Committee

Chairperson

Ms. Janet Davis, Director
JHU Evening College Center
5484-S Harpers Farm Road
Columbia, Maryland 21044

Members

Ms. Carol Breyer, Director
College Publications Center
P.G. Community College
301 Largo Avenue
Largo, Maryland 20870

Mr. John Dutrow
P.G. County Health Dept.
Cheverly, Maryland 20785

Ms. Carolee Husbands
Community Director
P.G. Co. Recreation Dept.
4400 Stamp Road #403
Marlow Heights, Maryland 20031

Ms. Carol Jean Messenger
Conference Coordinator
C and I Division
University of Maryland
University College
College Park, Maryland 20742

Ms. Margaret Thrasher
P.G. County Memorial Library
6532 Adelphi Road
Hyattsville, Maryland 20782

APPENDIX C

Project Newsletter

CS/CE profile

...INTERFACING THE COMMUNITY WITH SERVICE.

A periodic publication of The Maryland Community Services/Continuing Education Project partially funded by Program Impact, Maryland State Agency for Title I (HEA, 1965)

November 1975

DR. LEONARD NADLER IS FIRST CS/CE DIALOGUE LUNCHEON HOST

Would you like the opportunity to discuss issues of mutual concern with leaders in adult and continuing education? Would you like to meet and share ideas with fellow CS/CE professionals? If so, join us for the series of "Dialogue Luncheons."

Starting in December and continuing every fifth or sixth week throughout the spring, each luncheon in this series will be hosted by a VIP who will focus his remarks on a topic of concern to the field. Each luncheon will stress an informal and open exchange between participants and the guest speaker. Attendance will be kept low in order to maximize interaction.

The first CS/CE dialogue luncheon has been scheduled for Monday, December 15 from 12:00 noon to 3:00 p.m. at the University of Maryland University College, Center of Adult Education, Room 2110. Dr Leonard Nadler, Professor of Adult Education and HRD at the George Washington University will be the special host. The topic for this luncheon will concern a present view of training and education. If you would like to attend on December 15, fill out the registration form on the reverse side to reserve your space.

Although details for subsequent luncheons are still being worked out, you may wish to mark your calendar with the following dates which have been reserved for the remaining luncheons:

February 2 March 15 April 16 June 4

INTRODUCING THE CS/CE PROJECT

This is the first in what is anticipated to be a series of newsletters written to serve the diverse audience for *THE MARYLAND COMMUNITY SERVICES/CONTINUING EDUCATION PROJECT.* Because this project may be unfamiliar to you, we would like to introduce it by answering several questions that you probably have.

What Are the Purposes of This Project?

The overall purpose is to strengthen the many community service/continuing education programs conducted by institutions and organizations within Maryland. To help accomplish this, the project is developing and will provide a variety of training and professional development activities for personnel engaged in community service/continuing education through the winter and spring of 1976. Additionally, the project aims to develop and support mechanisms for increasing the cooperation and communication among those institutions, agencies, or organizations providing CS/CE services.

How Is This Project Funded?

The project is partially funded through the Maryland State Agency for Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965. Matching contributions are provided from participating organizations; through staff time allocated for participation in project programs and other such contributions.

Who Administers This Project?

The Conferences & Institutes Division of the University of Maryland University College. Your project staff is: Dr. John H. Buskey, Chairman, CS/CE Advisory Committee, Dr. David E Hartl, Project Director, Mr. David Chittenden, Project Coordinator, Ms. Dorothy R. Clark, Project Secretary. An Advisory Committee composed of representatives from participating institutions assists the project staff in the management and implementation of this project.

What Will I Get Out of This Project?

Opportunities to further develop professional skills through participation in a variety of training activities. Opportunities to meet other CS/CE professionals as well as recognized leaders in the field of adult and continuing education.

Who May Attend Project Activities?

The project's training activities will be designed primarily for that individual who develops, manages, or administers programs which are of a community service or continuing education nature and that largely serve the Maryland public.

What Will Each Training Activity Cost?

Very little. Since the developmental and many of the program expenses are paid for by the Title I funds, the cost for each participant is very low. However, there will normally be a small registration fee to pay for items such as coffee, lunch (if any is scheduled) and those registration materials which the project funds don't cover.

How Can I Get Further Information?

Call 454-5241 and ask for Dorothy Clark or David Chittenden. If they can't answer your questions, they will know who can.

CS/CE INFORMATION AND TRAINING NEEDS SURVEY COMPLETED

In September a statewide survey was conducted to assess the training concerns of individuals working in the CS/CE field. 425 surveys were mailed out to CS/CE personnel who work within community colleges, four-year colleges and universities, industry and government training units, voluntary or non-profit educational organizations, libraries, recreation and parks departments, etc. 225 surveys (roughly 53%) were returned, representing, to some degree, all of the groups identified above.

The results of the survey will be used to help make decisions regarding the various training activities to be developed and offered by the project. Among the subject areas cited as being possible training concerns, the following areas were ranked highest:

- techniques for researching and analyzing community needs
- effective long-range program planning and forecasting
- developing effective management skills
- techniques for developing and evaluating specific educational program ideas
- program planning methods and models
- proposal writing and grantsmanship
- identifying and reaching specific target audiences
- developing a total promotional strategy for a specific program
- principles and methods of professional staff development
- management of specific program activity budgets

Overall, of the 30 specific subject areas included in the survey, those having to do with program planning and development, management, and promotion were ranked the highest. This finding was generally true regardless of the specific organization or group of CS/CE personnel responding to the survey.

Based upon these results, three planning committees have been organized to design and develop training activities for winter and spring of next year. Serving on each planning committee are representatives from the diversity of groups this project intends to serve. Future issues of the PROFILE will keep you posted on specific dates, locations, and times concerning these programs and how you may attend any or all of them.

If you would like more complete and detailed information about the survey and the survey results, a limited number of copies of the survey analysis are available and will be sent to you upon request.

SHARE YOUR IDEAS

Space will be reserved in each subsequent newsletter to provide the opportunity for you to share and communicate your ideas, plans, programs, procedures, etc. with others. For instance if you are trying out an innovative program format and want to share its success or failure with others in the field, call or write and tell us about it......if you have initiated a new form or set of procedures which aid you and your organization, tell us about it so we can share that idea with others who may be working on the same or a similar thing.

* * *

FREE

Selected Bibliographic Survey of Resources for Community Services and Continuing Education. Printed in July 1975, this up-to-date bibliography serves to identify those references which a select group of CS/CE professionals felt have been the most useful to them in strengthening their skills and knowledge as practitioners in the field. If you would like a copy, return the attached request form. The quantity is limited so act soon.

REGISTRATION/REQUEST FORM

Name: ______________________ Telephone Number: ______________

Address: ____

Organization: ____

Please register me for the December 15th Dialogue Luncheon with Dr. Leonard Nadler...$5.00

Please send me:

_____ A copy of the CS/CE Bibliographic Survey of Resources
_____ Results of the CS/CE Information and Training Needs Survey
_____ More information about the Project

Make checks payable to THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND. Send this form to: *CS/CE PROJECT, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, CONFERENCES AND INSTITUTES DIVISION, UNIVERSITY BOULEVARD AT ADELPHI ROAD, COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND 20742.*

csce profile

...INTERFACING THE COMMUNITY WITH SERVICE.

A periodic publication of The Maryland Community Services/Continuing Education Project partially funded by Program Impact, Maryland State Agency for Title I (HEA, 1965)

January 1976

FEDERAL LEGISLATION IS TOPIC FOR DIALOGUE LUNCHEON ON FEBRUARY 6

The second Dialogue Luncheon will be on February 6th and will explore the issues and implications of impending Federal legislation affecting the CS/CE enterprise. Dr. Roman Verhaalen, Dean of the Evening College at Johns Hopkins University will moderate a panel discussion which will include people working directly with developing or monitoring Federal legislation. Those who have been invited to serve on this panel are:

Ms. Ellen Hoffman, Staff Director
Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth

Mr. Richard Smith, Counsel
The Committee for Full Funding of Education

Dr. James Turman, Executive Director
National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education

Mr. Newton Cattell, Chairman
National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, and
Director, Federal Relations, Penn State Univ.

Ms. Jean Frohlicher, Chief Counsel
Senate Committee on Education and Labor

If you are interested in participating in this Dialogue Luncheon, please mail in the registration form. If you have any further questions, please call David Chittenden or Dorothy Clark at (301) 454-5241.

REPORT ON DECEMBER 15 CS/CE DIALOGUE LUNCHEON

The presentation made by Dr. Leonard Nadler at the first CS/CE Dialogue Luncheon on December 15 stimulated considerable dialogue among the participants. The focus of much of the discussion centered on several probable futures or emerging realities which Dr. Nadler stressed would require some innovative and thoughtful response by the adult and continuing education profession. Some of the central issues and questions discussed included the following:

-What is the role of adult education in responding to the changing nature of work and the work force?

-How can adult education provide a greater array of programs and program formats to better serve the increasing number of older learners?

-With Watergate and politics, the issue of biogenetics, etc., what role can adult education play in helping influence ethical reform and clarifying the issues involved in future ethical dilemmas?

-With accountability becoming an increasingly important issue, are the number of participants in a program the only important indicator of success? Or, are there some broader concepts which would better indicate the success of a program and provide a more meaningful mechanism of accountability?

NEW ASSOCIATION FORMED

The newly formed Maryland Association for Community Education has as one of its primary goals the increased cooperation and communication among Maryland agencies, organizations, and institutions for purposes of increasing the effective delivery of human services. If you are involved with the development, administration, or delivery of community services, and are interested in meeting others from a variety of organizations providing similar services, you might be interested in calling or writing for further information about M.A.C.E. The contact persons are: Ms. Nola Arnold, Montgomery College, Rockville, Md., (301) 762-0015 and Mr. Bob Tune, Dept. of Educ., Balt., (301) 396-6704.

JOHN BUSKEY GOES TO NEBRASKA

Dr. John H. Buskey, Chairman of the CS/CE Advisory Committee and Director of the Conferences and Institutes Division at University of Maryland University College, has accepted and will assume in February the position of Assistant Dean for Instructional Systems in the University of Nebraska Extension Division. Dr. Buskey, who has been an invaluable leader to the CS/CE Project throughout its two and one-half years of activities, will be greatly missed. Dr. David E. Hartl, Assistant Director of Conferences and Institutes Division, and Project Director of the CS/CE Project will assume the chairmanship of the CS/CE Advisory Committee.

CORRECTION

In the last Profile incorrect dates were given for future Dialogue Luncheons. The correct dates are:

March 12　　April 30　　May 28

Mark your calendars.

WINTER AND SPRING CS/CE WORKSHOPS PLANNED

Reserve dates on your calendar NOW for the upcoming training events described below. Detailed announcements describing each workshop will be distributed in the near future. If you are not on our mailing list (did not receive a copy of the Profile directly) and are interested in learning more about these workshops, please return the attached information request form at your earliest convenience. Since Project funds are available to cover most of the workshop expenses, registration fees will be nominal.

WORKSHOP IN PROGRAM PROMOTION

Practical Promotion Skills
March 23 and 24, 1976
University of Maryland University College

Core concepts and elements of promotion; developing promotional strategies; direct mail procedures; principles of graphics design and visual arts; writing for radio, T.V., and newspapers; developing brochures and flyers; using photography in promotion; and critiquing of participants' materials.

Planning Committee: Janet Davis, The Johns Hopkins University; Carol Breyer, P.G. Community College; John Dutrow, P.G. County Health Department; Carolee Husbands, P.G. County Recreation Department; Carol Messenger, University of Maryland; William A. Seth, Chesapeake College, Margaret Thrasher, P.G. County Memorial Library; Carlton Caldwell, University of Maryland.

WORKSHOPS IN MANAGEMENT

Interviewing and Selecting Staff
March 4, 1976
University of Maryland University College

Evaluation of applications, methods of conducting interviews, questions that can and cannot be asked, selection process, etc.

Improving Performance Evaluation
April 21, 1976
University of Maryland University College

Overcoming resistance to evaluation, evaluation techniques, evaluation instruments, giving negative evaluations, following through on evaluations, etc.

Working In An Ad Hoc Group
May 4, 1976
Johns Hopkins University Evening College Center

Organizing the group, roles of group members, leadership strategies, common problems and solution alternatives, etc.

Styles of Leadership Workshop
February 25-26, 1976 - Catonsville Community College, and
April 13-14, 1976 - Hagerstown Community College

Concepts and applications of leadership styles using Blake & Mouton's "Managerial Grid."® Participants will be given an opportunity to explore through group activities their own leadership style and its impact on others.

Planning Committee: Bette Coplan, University of Maryland; Jane Christie, YWCA; Robert Critchlow, Catonsville Community College; Jim Hughes, Commercial Credit Co.; Barbara Manchak, The Johns Hopkins University, Rebekah Weir, P.G. County Memorial Library; Mary Wells, P.G. County Recreation Department; Joan Wolle, Md. State Dept. of Health & Mental Hygiene.

WORKSHOP IN PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Community Needs Assessment Workshop
April 5 and 6 and May 6, 1976
University of Maryland University College

Exploration of needs assessment model; instrument design and construction; conducting a needs assessment; analysis and interpretation of informational data; innovative approaches to cooperative or interagency needs assessment.

Planning Committee: Gerald Hanberry, P.G. Community College; Nola Arnold, Montgomery Community College, June Bricker, University of Maryland; Linda Carman, Montgomery Co. Dept. of Recreation; Bette Kellam, Maryland Hospital Education Institute; Steve McCormick, YMCA; Harold Schaffer, Salisbury State College; Ernst Selig, Department of Economic and Community Development; Elliot Shelkrot, Maryland State Department of Education; John Wilson, University of Maryland.

Note: To err is human: to really foul things up requires a computer!

REGISTRATION/INFORMATION REQUEST FORM

Name: ______________________ Organization: ______________________ Phone: __________

Address: ______________________ City ______ State ______ Zip ______

______ Please register me for the February 6th Dialogue Luncheon $6.00

______ Please add me to your mailing list and send announcements of upcoming workshops.

Make checks payable to THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND. Send this form to: CS/CE Project, University of Maryland University College, C & I Division, University Blvd. at Adelphi Road, College Park, Maryland 20742.

cs/ce profile

...INTERFACING THE COMMUNITY WITH SERVICE.

A periodic publication of The Maryland Community Services/Continuing Education Project partially funded by Program Impact, Maryland State Agency for Title I (HEA, 1965)

March 1976

Promotion Skills Workshop Set For March 23 and 24

If your job involves you in the promoting or publicizing of programs or other types of activities, you may be interested in the upcoming two-day Practical Promotion Skills Workshop being held at the University of Maryland University College on March 23 and 24. A major goal of the workshop is to provide each participant the maximum flexibility and opportunity to fulfill his/her own needs in promotion. The workshop will serve this goal by including general sessions stressing basic theories and concepts of program promotion, mini-workshop sessions covering specific skill areas, a resource/exhibit room providing the opportunity to consult with the general session leaders, a critique panel evaluating participant promotional materials, and follow-up field trips to reinforce workshop materials. If you are interested in attending, fill out the attached registration/request form and return as indicated. Complete program and resource leadership information will be sent to you immediately.

Leadership Skills Workshop Scheduled for Hagerstown Area

Concern for people and concern for production serve as the cornerstones for guaging the effectiveness of one's leadership style according to Robert C. Bower, instructor of the "Styles of Leadership Workshop" held at Catonsville Community College on February 25 and 26. For two intensive days, participants at this workshop examined the specifics of these leadership concerns especially as they related to their own personal leadership style. Both the processes and the tools used at this workshop were developed by Drs. Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton. Mr. Bower will be conducting the identical workshop on April 13 and 14 at Hagerstown Community College. If you would like information about attending this workshop, send in the attached request form, or call Mrs. Dorothy Clark at 454-5241.

March 12 Dialogue Luncheon To Examine The Relationship of the Health/Human Services Profession to Continuing Education

The relationship of Health and Human Services professions to continuing education organizations will be the topic for the March 12 Dialogue Luncheon. This month's luncheon will focus on the crucial issues concerning programming sponsorship and responsibilities as well as possible trends in the continuing education needs of the health and human services professional. Providing clarity to and stimulating discussion about these issues will be a panel moderated by Mr. Jim Oates, Director of Community Services and Continuing Education at Catonsville Community College. Panelists will include: Mr. Chuck Cacace, Director of Continuing Education, School of Social Work and Community Planning, University of Maryland at Baltimore; Mr. Frank T. Jones, Executive Director, American Lung Association of Maryland; Ms. Pat Koonz, Director of Continuing Education, School of Nursing, University of Maryland at Baltimore; Dr. Harold Schaffer, Director of Continuing Education, Salisbury State College.

The luncheon will be held at the Terrace Lounge of the University of Maryland at Baltimore Student Union. If you would like to join us on the 12th, send in the attached registration form. Directions to the luncheon will be sent upon receipt of your registration. For further information call Mr. David Chittenden or Mrs. Dorothy Clark at 454-5241.

Impending Federal Legislation Discussed at CS/CE Dialogue Luncheon

Impending Federal legislation which will impact on the CS/CE enterprise was the topic for the February 6 Dialogue Luncheon. The panel, moderated by Dr. Roman Verhaalen, Dean of the Evening College at Johns Hopkins University made brief opening presentations summarizing their perspectives on upcoming or current legislation in this area. Mr. Newton Cattell, Chairman of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education outlined the Advisory Council's legislative proposals and the status of these proposals in both the House and Senate. According to Cattell, "There is no focus in government for postsecondary continuing education."

"The problem is an administrative one," he says, "for each year the Administration recommends that Congress discontinue the program authorized by Title I." In congressional hearings on this law, his council made two points: they termed the "administrative climate of the community program authorized by Title I as 'malign neglect'." Secondly, they asked that the Title I law be broadened to include all of continuing education, not just community services. Cattell explained, "Although the name of our title is CSCE, its program is essentially one of community service." He continued that he was not "putting down" community service, but that Title I should be concerned with all aspects of continuing education, not only community services.

His council, he says, recommends that Title I contain all our continuing education programs and that it become the continuing education title in fact as well as in name.

Cattell suggested a four-point plan for support of postsecondary continuing education:

*Have Title I ammended to mandate an office of continuing education to be located within the Bureau of Postsecondary Education in the U.S. Office of Education. The office would only concern itself with postsecondary education and not the broad spectrum of lifelong learning. Without such an office he predicted that Title I will not survive the 1980 reauthorization of the HEA.

*Establish a national policy act on Lifelong Learning. He explained that too many varied proposals concerning this subject are being introduced in Congress. What is needed is an act that would be national in scope and uniform.

*Statewide planning of continuing education. All continuing education programs should be replicable and expandable.

*Provide support in community service.

Cattell confessed that the present status of these proposals is confusing, but that they have gained favorable recognition from congressional legislators.

"We are confident that Title I will be reauthorized," he closed, "but, we think it is imperative that the Administration be required by law to administer the program conscientiously."

Lloyd Davis, Executive Director of the National University Extension Association, advised those attending to become aware of the variety of funding sources for continuing education programs. "No matter how austere the national budget, there is always some money available." For instance, the energy crisis stimulated development of the energy policy and conservation bill which provided provisions for the states to organize statewide continuing education programs to aid in the effort to conserve energy. According to Davis, it has been true historically that federal money for continuing education is most available when continuing education might provide solutions or make inputs to problems of national concern. Davis believes that congress perceives excessive duplication and overlapping between the various continuing education legislative proposals it is considering, among them the Lifelong Learning Act (Mondale Bill), Title I and the Hathaway Amendments. He stressed that there is a need to look at continuing education as a whole, make the effort to list priorities, determine who is and is not receiving support, and where gaps exist which need legislative attention.

Eugene Weldon, Chief of Community Services and Continuing Education programs at the U.S. Office of Education, pointed out that adult educators cannot assume that implementation of legislation is automatic. Legislation, he commented, is a springboard. It does not serve people directly, but instead, provides the base for serving. Once legislation is obtained, regulations and guidelines must be created for implementation. The relationship between the federal and state levels in carrying out legislation should be one of creative tension in which differences of approach and opinion are allowed and encouraged.

James Turman, Executive Director of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education provided some interesting statistics for those attending the luncheon to ponder:

*There are 100 programs of continuing education administered by 16 different agencies.

*The Commissioner of Education at the Office of Education only has 25-30% of Federal legislation programs in education under his purview, that is up to 75% of continuing education programs are under the jurisdiction of other agencies.

It behooves adult educators, regardless of their particular situation, to become familiar with the variety of government organizations which can provide support for their continuing education program.

. . . .

REGISTRATION/INFORMATION REQUEST FORM

Name: ______________________ Organization: ________________ Phone: __________

Address: ____ __________

City State Zip

☐ Please register me for the March 23 & 24 Promotion Skills Workshop.........$12.00
☐ Please register me for the March 12 Dialogue Luncheon.......................$ 6.00
☐ Please register me for the April 13 and 14 Leadership Skills Workshop.....$15.00
☐ Please add me to your mailing list and send announcements of workshops.

Make checks payable to THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND. Send this form to: CS/CE Project, University of Maryland University College, C and I Division, University Blvd. at Adelphi Road, College Park, Maryland 20742

APPENDIX D

WORKSHOP EVALUATION SUMMARIES

TITLE OF WORKSHOP: STYLES OF LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP

DATES OF WORKSHOP: February 25 and 26, 1976

OVERALL RATING

3.44

	Average Rating		1	2	3	4	
THE STATED GOALS OF THE WORKSHOP	3.7	UNCLEAR		1-6%	3-18%	12-76%	COMPLETELY CLEAR
THE STATED GOALS OF THE WORKSHOP	3.6	NOT ACHIEVED			7-43%	9-57%	COMPLETELY ACHIEVED
YOUR PERSONAL GOALS FOR THE WORKSHOP	3.4	NOT ACHIEVED			10-62%	6-38%	COMPLETELY ACHIEVED
THE DESIGN OF THE WORKSHOP	3.2	POOR		3-19%	7-43%	6-38%	SUPERIOR
MY INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROCESS	3.4	SHALLOW		2-12%	5-31%	9-57%	DEEP
THE RELEVANCE OF THE WORKSHOP CONTENT TO MY WORK	3.6	IRRELEVANT			6-38%	10-62%	HIGHLY RELEVANT
THE PRESENTATIONS AND FACILITATION PROCESS OF THE WORKSHOP LEADER	3.2	UNHELPFUL			13-81%	3-19%	EXTREMELY HELPFUL

Styles of Leadership
February 25 and 26, 1976

What were the best aspects of the workshop for you?

- good organization
- group activity - interaction (4)
- lecturettes, films, etc.
- introduction and explanation of managerial grid
- involvement with people from other agencies
- grid complication
- instrument design and application
- coincided with present needs

What were the worst aspects of the workshop for you?

- being restrictive in small groups
- movie questions too tricky
- physical arrangements
- no negative comments
- too many tests
- first day group sessions
- waste of time in starting
- instruments and time consumed
- N.A.

What changes would you suggest to improve the workshop?

- better variety of learning experiences
- more reliance on text
- precise matching & placement of small groups
- concentrate on main individual explorations
- start at 8:00 and end at 4:00 - avoid traffic jams
- start at 8:30

What is your general, overall estimate of the value of this workshop?

- EXCELLENT
- VERY GOOD
- Understanding of how people work or manage and how they help our organization
- Very positive! Can be related to job environment
- Dynamite Stuff to me!
- Learned a lot in this field where I had no awareness
- I have gained a great deal--hope to put the knowledge into action
- VERY VALUABLE!
- Very high!
- Very good--stimulating!!

TITLE OF WORKSHOP: INTERVIEWING AND SELECTING STAFF WORKSHOP

DATES OF WORKSHOP: March 2, 1976

OVERALL RATING

3.52

	Average Rating		1	2	3	4	
THE STATED GOALS OF THE WORKSHOP	3.8	UNCLEAR			4-22%	15-78%	COMPLETELY CLEAR
THE STATED GOALS OF THE WORKSHOP	3.3	NOT ACHIEVED		1-5%	11-58%	7-37%	COMPLETELY ACHIEVED
YOUR PERSONAL GOALS FOR THE WORKSHOP	3.2	NOT ACHIEVED		1-5%	14-73%	4-22%	COMPLETELY ACHIEVED
THE DESIGN OF THE WORKSHOP	3.5	POOR			10-53%	9-47%	SUPERIOR
MY INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROCESS	3.2	SHALLOW		1-5%	14-73%	4-22%	DEEP
THE RELEVANCE OF THE WORKSHOP CONTENT TO MY WORK	3.8	IRRELEVANT			4-22%	15-78%	HIGHLY RELEVANT
THE PRESENTATIONS AND FACILITATION PROCESS OF THE WORKSHOP LEADER	3.9	UNHELPFUL			1-5%	18-95%	EXTREMELY HELPFUL

Interviewing and Selecting Staff Workshop
March 2, 1976

What changes would you suggest to improve the workshop?

- two-day sessions for more indepth discussion (2)
- use jobs everyone is familiar with
- more role playing
- more on matching people to jobs
- too much overview
- more emphasis on affirmative action
- more time for practice interview
- arrange so that people are separated from those they work with
- more details on EOE requirements
- more group involvement
- have roles compatible with sex
- first role playing so difficult because of many pages involved in set-up

What were the best aspects of the workshop for you?

- results of role playing (3)
- planning for interviewing (2)
- practice interviews (2)
- breaking into groups
- avoidance of pitfalls
- last role play
- exposure to other people with similar problems
- EOE
- informal nature of workshop
- materials on preparing for interviews
- handouts good
- ideas for questions
- individual exercises
- specifics
- well planned and relaxed

What is your general, overall estimate of the value of this workshop?

- very good (3)
- very helpful (2)
- excellent (2)
- valuable (2)
- program will make me effective in aspects of my job
- good
- refreshes techniques
- good for a beginner
- practical

List any further issues related to Interviewing & Selecting Staff that you would recommend being covered in a subsequent workshop on this area.

- reject letters
- more information on EOE
- more on affirmative action problems
- weighing priorities of requirements

TITLE OF WORKSHOP: PRACTICAL PROMOTION SKILLS

DATES OF WORKSHOP: March 23 and 24, 1976

OVERALL RATING

3.01

	Average Rating		1	2	3	4	
THE STATED GOALS OF THE WORKSHOP	3.10	UNCLEAR	1-2%	11-17%	32-50%	20-31%	VERY CLEAR
THE STATED GOALS OF THE WORKSHOP	2.84	NOT ACHIEVED		17-26%	40-63%	7-11%	COMPLETELY ACHIEVED
YOUR PERSONAL GOALS FOR THE WORKSHOP	2.90	NOT ACHIEVED	2-3%	14-22%	36-56%	12-19%	COMPLETELY ACHIEVED
THE OVERALL DESIGN OF THE WORKSHOP	3.30	POOR		4-6%	41-62%	21-32%	SUPERIOR
THE RELEVANCE OF THE GENERAL SESSIONS CONTENT TO MY WORK							
General Session I (Overview & Definitions)	3.16	IRRELEVANT	3-5%	9-15%	24-29%	25-41%	HIGHLY RELEVANT
General Session II (Promotional Strategies)	2.59	IRRELEVANT	9-15%	20-34%	16-27%	14-24%	HIGHLY RELEVANT
General Session III (Evaluation)	3.28	IRRELEVANT	1-2%	8-15%	18-35%	25-48%	HIGHLY RELEVANT
General Session IV (Critique Panel)	3.23	IRRELEVANT		6-16%	17-45%	15-39%	HIGHLY RELEVANT

Practical Promotion Skills (con't.)

	Average Rating		1	2	3	4	
THE PRESENTATIONS OF THE:							
General Session I & II Leader (B. Posner)	2.94	UNHELPFUL	4-7%	15-25%	20-34%	20-34%	EXTREMELY HELPFUL
General Session III Leader (P. Hunt)	3.50	UNHELPFUL		3-5%	20-38%	30-57%	EXTREMELY HELPFUL
MINI-WORKSHOPS EVALUATION							
Use of Radio and T.V. for Promotion							
Presentation of Workshop Leader	3.69	UNHELPFUL			11-31%	25-69%	EXTREMELY HELPFUL
Relevance of Workshop Content to Your Work	3.27	IRRELEVANT	2-5%	1-3%	18-50%	15-24%	HIGHLY RELEVANT
Using Photography in Promotion							
Presentation of Workshop Leader	2.78	UNHELPFUL	2-7%	7-25%	14-50%	5-18%	EXTREMELY HELPFUL
Relevance of Workshop Content to Your Work	3.10	IRRELEVANT	1-4%	6-21%	10-36%	11-39%	HIGHLY RELEVANT
Creative Use of Direct Mail							
Presentation of Workshop Leader	3.36	UNHELPFUL	3-8%	3-8%	9-23%	23-61%	EXTREMELY HELPFUL
Relevance of Workshop Content to Your Work	3.48	IRRELEVANT		5-14%	8-23%	22-63%	HIGHLY RELEVANT

Practical Promotion Skills (con't.)

	Average Rating		1	2	3	4	
MINI-WORKSHOPS EVALUATION:							
How to Plan an Effective Exhibit							
Presentation of Workshop Leader	2.59	UNHELPFUL	7-19%	6-16%	19-51%	5-14%	EXTREMELY HELPFUL
Relevance of Workshop Content to Your Work	2.77	IRRELEVANT	3-1%	11-25%	13-29%	17-39%	HIGHLY RELEVANT
Developing Brochures and Flyers							
Presentation of Workshop Leader	2.6	UNHELPFUL	7-12%	17-30%	22-39%	10-19%	EXTREMELY HELPFUL
Relevance of Workshop Content to Your Work	2.9	IRRELEVANT	6-11%	11-20%	20-36%	18-33%	HIGHLY RELEVANT
A Process for Creative Problem Solving in Promotion							
Presentation of Workshop Leader	3.23	UNHELPFUL	1-2%	7-14%	20-41%	21-43%	EXTREMELY HELPFUL
Relevance of Workshop Content to Your Work	3.36	IRRELEVANT	2-4%	5-11%	13-29%	25-56%	HIGHLY RELEVANT
Use of Commercial Firms and Outside Marketing Resources							
Presentation of Workshop Leader	2.13	UNHELPFUL	5-31%	4-25%	7-44%		EXTREMELY HELPFUL
Relevance of Workshop Content to Your Work	2.13	IRRELEVANT	4-27%	5-33%	6-40%		HIGHLY RELEVANT

MINI-WORKSHOP EVALUATION:	Average Rating		1	2	3	4	
Writing for the Media							
Presentation of Workshop Leader	2.81	UNHELPFUL	3-9%	8-25%	13-41%	8-25%	EXTREMELY HELPFUL
Relevance of Workshop Content to Your Work	3.0	IRRELEVANT	4-12%	6-19%	8-25%	14-44%	HIGHLY RELEVANT
Principles of Graphics Design							
Presentation of Workshop Leader	2.46	UNHELPFUL	7-25%	6-21%	19-36%	5-18%	EXTREMELY HELPFUL
Relevance of Workshop Content to Your Work	2.77	IRRELEVANT	4-11%	12-33%	8-22%	12-33%	HIGHLY RELEVANT

Practical Promotion Skills
March 23 and 24, 1976

Which, if any, of your personal objectives for attending this workshop were not met?

- more specific information instead of general overview
- some workshop leaders more interested in publicizing firm than giving education information
- not enough direct application to marketing of community sources
- helped me realize some problems
- well planned, smooth running, good format
- major objective (obtaining brochure ideas) wasn't met
- more low cost advertising
- not enough "how to" information presented
- graphics design guidelines
- mini-workshops very elementary

What were the best aspects of the workshop for you?

- very helpful--first introduction into promotion
- general sessions (3)
- creative use of direct mail workshop
- impressed with speakers through knowledge of subject matter
- first two general sessions on direct mail
- workshops well-structured; topics were relevant
- workshops provided clarity
- excellent leadership
- technical ideas that I can use
- excellent professional presentation
- freedom of expression--superior surroundings
- resource information
- critique of brochures
- creative problem solving
- contacts
- "how to" groups
- variety
- excellent speakers
- well-planned--excellent job--got down to basics!!

What were the worst aspects of the workshop for you?

- photography and graphics design workshops were poor
- long stretches of sitting
- lots of technical jargon not familiar with
- many leaders above participants heads, assumed most of us had more resources and money than we have
- too much discussion from participants
- workshops didn't consider cost
- mini-workshops tried to do too much in span of time allotted
- resource room weak on resources
- critique sesson-not enough suggestions

Practical Promotion Skills
March 23 and 24, 1976

Worst aspects continued.

- why were all MEN leading workshops; out of 9 workshops, 6 were led by men
- critique panel-very negative

What changes would you suggest to improve the workshop?

- more information
- screen presentations
- provide speakers with key questions
- more interaction with participants too much lecturing
- bring down to more useful level
- less workshops with longer time allotted
- more in depth treatment on some subjects
- more structured leadership in creative problem solving
- explain workshops prior to start; some were advance, some basic, etc.
- aim at low budget organizations
- less general sessions
- try not to cram so much in so short a time
- better workshops
- workshops on advance level
- longer workshops
- don't involve so many commercial firms
- smokers should be segregated or no smoking allowed

TITLE OF WORKSHOP: INTERVIEWING AND SELECTING STAFF WORKSHOP

DATES OF WORKSHOP: March 31, 1976

OVERALL RATING

3.49

	Average Rating		1	2	3	4	
THE STATED GOALS OF THE WORKSHOP	3.86	UNCLEAR			2-13%	13-87%	COMPLETELY CLEAR
THE STATED GOALS OF THE WORKSHOP	3.4	NOT ACHIEVED			9-60%	6-40%	COMPLETELY ACHIEVED
YOUR PERSONAL GOALS FOR THE WORKSHOP	3.13	NOT ACHIEVED		4-27%	5-33%	6-40%	COMPLETELY ACHIEVED
THE DESIGN OF THE WORKSHOP	3.4	POOR		1-8%	7-46%	7-46%	SUPERIOR
MY INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROCESS	3.33	SHALLOW		2-14%	6-40%	7-46%	DEEP
THE RELEVANCE OF THE WORKSHOP CONTENT TO MY WORK	3.53	IRRELEVANT		1-7%	4-27%	10-66%	HIGHLY RELEVANT
THE PRESENTATIONS AND FACILITATION PROCESS OF THE WORKSHOP LEADER	3.80	UNHELPFUL			3-20%	12-80%	EXTREMELY HELPFUL

Interviewing and Selecting Staff Workshop
March 31, 1976

What changes would you suggest to improve the program?

- possibly more time
- have short role playing on job description
- get people with similar backgrounds together
- make coffee breaks shorter--increase participation time
- more case studies for experience
- too much information for one day

What were the best aspects of the workshop for you?

- planning and review for interviews
- handouts and printed information
- logical presentation of process
- glad it was small to participate
- basics reviewed
- opportunity to interact with peers
- realized complexity of interviewing process
- exchange of ideas
- EEO standards
- more ideas about interviewing
- leader encouraged participation
- participation
- actual interview do's and don'ts

What were the worst aspects of the workshop for you?

- getting acquainted was too long
- not having some questions answered
- finding out I couldn't eliminate my own problems
- not sure when to ask questions
- lack of time
- length of day
- varieties of participants

What is your general, overall estimate of the value of this workshop?

- valuable (2)
- good
- many clearer insights received
- good step forward for me
- excellent material
- not enough time to develop some areas
- good review
- worthwhile
- very good
- excellent
- valuable for new interviewer

List any further issues related to Interviewing & Selecting Staff that you would would recommend being covered in a subsequent workshop on this area.

- criteria to select applicants to be interviewed
- notification of employment

TITLE OF WORKSHOP: COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP

DATES OF WORKSHOP: April 5 and 6, 1976

OVERALL RATING

3.27

	Average Rating		1	2	3	4	
THE STATED GOALS OF THE WORKSHOP	3.20	UNCLEAR	2-8%	1-4%	14-56%	8-32%	COMPLETELY CLEAR
THE STATED GOALS OF THE WORKSHOP	3.13	NOT ACHIEVED		2-10%	16-69%	5-21%	COMPLETELY ACHIEVED
YOUR PERSONAL GOALS FOR THE WORKSHOP	3.16	NOT ACHIEVED		3-12%	15-60%	7-28%	COMPLETELY ACHIEVED
THE DESIGN OF THE WORKSHOP	3.30	POOR		2-9%	12-52%	9-39%	SUPERIOR
MY INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROCESS	3.20	SHALLOW		5-20%	10-40%	10-40%	DEEP
THE RELEVANCE OF THE WORKSHOP CONTENT TO MY WORK	3.56	IRRELEVANT		2-8%	7-28%	16-64%	HIGHLY RELEVANT
THE PRESENTATIONS AND FACILITATION PROCESS OF THE WORKSHOP LEADER	3.36	UNHELPFUL		1-4%	14-56%	10-40%	EXTREMELY HELPFUL

Community Needs Assessment Workshop
April 5 and 6, 1976

Which, if any, of your personal objectives for attending this workshop were not met?

- none (7)
- an instrument other than F.F. analysis to assess needs
- a clear step-by-step understanding of how to do a needs assessment
- unanswered (14)
- not enough help on criteria for selecting specific tools
- didn't achieve what I expected because my objectives were erroneous

What were the best aspects of the workshop for you?

- definition of needs assessment (2)
- style of leadership & leaders willingness to help
- ability to work on the N.A. process
- raised my consciousness of community needs
- pointed out my tools for assessment
- freedom to participate in determining daily agendum and to make decisions
- step-by-step practical application after explanation of each step of the process
- opportunities to experiment with aspects of techniques presented
- group work & interaction with others (6)
- working on real problems (4)
- learning a process
- F.F. Analysis
- process orientation
- handouts
- I learned something that will be very helpful to me

What were the worst aspects of the workshop for you?

- components of needs assessment drawn out
- lack of clarity in instructions and assigned talks (2)
- case study process was not what expected
- case study on Title I too sophisticated for group
- awkwardness before instructors began to mesh
- how to tie lecture info and handouts together to do a needs assessment
- pace slower than necessary
- too much repetition
- case study little relevancy to me
- the process was fragmented
- participants who didn't stick to agend
- monday's specific problem solving

Community Needs Assessment Workshop
April 5 and 6, 1976

What changes would you suggest to improve the workshop?

- follow-up date moved up
- more help with the groups
- small groups/more frequent changing (2)
- more detail on each step of the process
- a reminder of tools was needed before step H
- sharing can be overdone
- less time on case study or allow more time to work on it
- more organized handouts (2)
- clear instructions of tasks
- more instrumentation and tools
- some material in shorter time
- more control of time
- time enough to submit to leaders the problems so they can be ready to address the problem
- run through examples before jumping into participation

What is your general, overall estimate of the value of this workshop?

- very valuable (4)
- very good (3)
- good
- helpful
- extremely good
- valuable (4)
- too early to say (3)
- very good
- very helpful
- excellent (2)

TITLE OF WORKSHOP: IMPROVING PERFORMANCE EVALUATION WORKSHOP

DATES OF WORKSHOP: April 21, 1976

OVERALL RATING

3.36

	Average Rating		1	2	3	4	
THE STATED GOALS OF THE WORKSHOP	3.46	UNCLEAR		2-6%	13-41%	17-53%	COMPLETELY CLEAR
THE STATED GOALS OF THE WORKSHOP	3.46	NOT ACHIEVED		1-3%	15-47%	16-50%	COMPLETELY ACHIEVED
YOUR PERSONAL GOALS FOR THE WORKSHOP	3.37	NOT ACHIEVED		3-9%	14-44%	15-47%	COMPLETELY ACHIEVED
THE DESIGN OF THE WORKSHOP	3.37	POOR		1-3%	18-56%	13-41%	SUPERIOR
MY INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROCESS	3.12	SHALLOW		5-16%	17-55%	9-29%	DEEP
THE RELEVANCE OF THE WORKSHOP CONTENT TO MY WORK	3.12	IRRELEVANT		5-15%	19-58%	9-27%	HIGHLY RELEVANT
THE PRESENTATIONS AND FACILITATION PROCESS OF THE WORKSHOP LEADER	3.65	UNHELPFUL		1-3%	9-28%	22-69%	EXTREMELY HELPFUL

Improving Performance Evaluation Workshop
April 21, 1976

Which, if any, of your personal objectives for attending this workshop were not met?

- would like to have been given that 'perfect' instrument of evaluation
- faculty evaluations
- consideration of methods of evaluating teaching effectiveness
- all and more
- none I can think of
- none
- wanted to learn about introducing a system where none existed before
- all were met
- thought it would be more concerned with higher education institutions

What were the best aspects of the workshop for you?

- relevance to needs
- leaders compensatory supplementing of participants' contributions
- effective teaching methods used by Mr. Horsmon
- content was extremely good--all material was fully covered with continuity rarely achieved
- overview of performance appraisal well prepared
- Mr. Horsmon
- discussion of evaluation tool
- guidelines for evaluating forms
- comparing different methods of evaluating-listing positive/negative aspects
- morning presentation of various elements
- sample interview and evaluation forms interesting and helpful
- all aspects helpful
- discussion of forms
- informative/informal
- ingredients for successful evaluation system
- defining objectives, techniques
- evaluating other instruments and comparing them to present system
- role playing
- appraisal interviews
- critique of various instruments
- group activities
- objectives and techniques
- performances evaluation interviews
- evaluation of appraisal instruments
- identification of elements - needed in developing an evaluation plan
- evaluation interviews very helpful
- review of evaluation form and role playing situations
- experience factor of the instructor/practical exercises
- good overview generalization technique

What were the worst aspects of the workshop for you?

- evaluation and intrigue of sample forms
- personal involvement could have been discussed
- roleplaying was drawn out
- sorry that "introduction of the system" was left out--had hoped to learn something from this
- breaks and lunch period too long - suggest 10 minute break
- stretched a bit too far into the afternoon
- role playing
- lengthy
- should have had more introduction to participants
- objectives and ingredients for success
- not enough depth into subject matter
- lack of particular treatment of college problems

What changes would you suggest to improve the workshop?

- develop follow-up to some topics
- send information to participants before workshop
- bring evaluation forms from the participants
- more interviews
- talk more on the pros and cons of MBO
- two-day workshop to cover matter in depth (2)
- prefer leader to run meetings rather than discussion by group

What is your general, overall estimate of the value of this workshop?

- too broad an audience
- great
- valuable
- excellent (4)
- very valuable
- very helpful and useful to me (3)
- quite helpful
- Mack Horsmon did an excellent job--very impressed
- very good (7)
- useful (2)
- helped open my eyes to other aspects of personnel
- very well presented and organized
- time well spent
- helped me understand evaluation system
- more supervisors should be involved

TITLE OF WORKSHOP: STYLES OF LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP

DATES OF WORKSHOP: April 28 and 29, 1976

OVERALL RATING

3.72

	Average Rating		1	2	3	4	
THE STATED GOALS OF THE WORKSHOP	4.0	UNCLEAR				8-100%	COMPLETELY CLEAR
THE STATED GOALS OF THE WORKSHOP	3.7	NOT ACHIEVED			2-25%	6-75%	COMPLETELY ACHIEVED
YOUR PERSONAL GOALS FOR THE WORKSHOP	3.7	NOT ACHIEVED			2-25%	6-75%	COMPLETELY ACHIEVED
THE DESIGN OF THE WORKSHOP	3.7	POOR			2-25%	6-75%	SUPERIOR
MY INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROCESS	3.5	SHALLOW		1-12%	2-25%	5-63%	DEEP
THE RELEVANCE OF THE WORKSHOP CONTENT TO MY WORK	3.5	IRRELEVANT		1-12%	3-38%	4-50%	HIGHLY RELEVANT
THE PRESENTATIONS AND FACILITATION PROCESS OF THE WORKSHOP LEADER	4.0	UNHELPFUL				8-100%	EXTREMELY HELPFUL

Styles of Leadership Workshop
April 28 and 29, 1976

Which, if any, of your personal objectives for attending this workshop were not met?

- both were specifically achieved
- how to cope in a political setting without compromising
- preparation for management

What were the best aspects of the workshop for you?

- films
- learning the grid concept
- not long enough
- solving exercises
- group tasks
- performance of workshop leader
- group interaction
- self evaluation
- surveys
- small group
- processing
- learned how to approach co-workers and supervisors

What were the worst aspects of the workshop for you?

- not long enough
- I question the validity of certain task answers
- timing - too much on first day, too little on second day

What changes would you suggest to improve the workshop?

- additional time
- keep trainees together
- increase team and group work
- provide it more often
- extend principles with films and lectur
- build in more emotionally involving tas
- not so long - 2 days more than enough

What is your general, overall, estimate of the value of this workshop?

- excellent tool for evaluation
- extremely useful 2-day experience
- applicable
- surprisingly helpful
- valuable
- very good
- informative
- very effective tool for any individual

TITLE OF WORKSHOP: WORKING IN AN AD HOC GROUP

DATES OF WORKSHOP: May 4, 1976

OVERALL RATING

3.47

	Average Rating		1	2	3	4	
THE STATED GOALS OF THE WORKSHOP	3.7	UNCLEAR		1-7%	2-14%	11-79%	COMPLETELY CLEAR
THE STATED GOALS OF THE WORKSHOP	3.3	NOT ACHIEVED		1-7%	8-53%	6-40%	COMPLETELY ACHIEVED
YOUR PERSONAL GOALS FOR THE WORKSHOP	3.14	NOT ACHIEVED		1-7%	10-71%	3-21%	COMPLETELY ACHIEVED
THE DESIGN OF THE WORKSHOP	3.43	POOR			8-57%	6-43%	SUPERIOR
MY INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROCESS	3.43	SHALLOW			8-57%	6-43%	DEEP
THE RELEVANCE OF THE WORKSHOP CONTENT TO MY WORK	3.53	IRRELEVANT		1-7%	5-33%	9-44%	HIGHLY RELEVANT
THE PRESENTATIONS AND FACILITATION PROCESS OF THE WORKSHOP LEADER	3.79	UNHELPFUL			3-21%	11-79%	EXTREMELY HELPFUL

Working in an Ad Hoc Group
April 5 and 6, 1976

Which, if any, of your personal objectives for attending this workshop were not met?

- how to cut off superfluous comments
- would like to have a bibliography of articles and resource materials
- how to implement an effective groups
- how to make my group more effective
- provided a framework
- more concrete skill definitions and how to employ them

What were the best aspects of the workshop for you?

- interaction of group (4)
- good size group-responsive to design
- group was open, honest & free from value judgements
- tasks assigned
- personal involvement
- effective, time limited
- good personal vibes
- quality of leadership
- leaders skilled and interesting (2)
- small groups
- non-threatening atmosphere
- helpful comments
- participate freely
- excellent outline
- describing leadership responsibilities
- atmosphere

What were the worst aspects of the workshop for you?

- lack of time (2)
- two key people had to leave early
- little concrete information
- first evaluation premature
- wondering how to modify my behavior for maximum benefit
- may have tried to do too much
- the theory
- more actual skill practice
- pressure of time
- too much time in processing

What changes would you suggest to improve the workshop?

- make it more concrete
- more time on group problems and individual problems
- change groups around - more interaction
- add a bibliography or some tasks to take back

What is your general, overall estimate of the value of this workshop?

- well organized and presented
- helpful, provocative, enjoyable
- good topic
- valuable for meeting people & sharing ideas

- extremely valuable
- well organized and presented
- instructors well qualified
- warm response of leaders
- adult oriented
- informative
- learned application and techniques
- introductions well handled
- non-threatening
- thoroughly enjoyed it
- very good
- valuable in relation to my job

APPENDIX E

Newsletter Critique

EFFECTIVE MEANS OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION

The newsletter:

1. should be an effective means of communication. It should fulfill the needs of all the members of the organization.

2. should provide useful and meaningful information, not SMALL TALK. It should not be used merely as an announcement or bulletin telling members what is going to happen and what has happened. It must also be an educating device. A newsletter for CS/CE should, for example, describe current and upcoming forms of community services and continuing education at various institutions and organizations. These forms could be not only found in the State of Maryland, but in organizations throughout the country.

3. must tell its readers things they did not already know. Its editor must see to it that the public is enlightened with factual and helpful information. This approach will put both the newsletter and the editor in a highly credible light. The organization's public will look forward to reading the publication and will learn to refer to it for guidance and information.

4. should not emphasize who spoke at a luncheon and where it was held. This is hardly informative. People want to know the highlights of what happened. What did the speaker say? What are some contrary viewpoints? How will what happened affect them and their organization? What can be done to deter or promote the matter? What has been done? Was it successful? Why or why not?

When dealing with a workshop situation tell what was covered. What did the speakers say? How would it have been (or be) useful to their organization. Has it been helpful to others in the past? How? If the speaker is interesting a feature article may draw interest from the readers. Why does he believe in the program? What personal satisfaction does he get from it? How has he seen his program as successful in helping organizations?

5. should follow-up all events with letters, editorials and/or opinions and comments from one or more of the participants. These follow-ups could deal with the actual program itself or they could deal with the abstract and concrete issues and questions covered. Find out if the workshop has helped them in their job capacities. Have they seen changes? Are they implementing new ideas or re-vamping old ones?

6. must give solid case studies or facts to back up theory and speculation. Readers enjoy reading about new theories and proposals, but they also want to know how successfully these ideas are being put into circulation. This service takes research and time on the part of the writer. Because of this triviality this aspect of the newsletter is usually shrugged off. Unfortunately few organizations begin using new ideas unless they are sure they will work, or at least have a good possibility of working. One of the main purposes of a newsletter is to communicate specialized information to a specialized public. If the public does not get the news from its own publication, where will it get it from? The grapevine form of communication will take too long and the new idea's success or failure will be outdated before it is initiated.

Graphics: a visually appealing newsletter

1. a monthly newsletter should look as though it were put together with interest and care, otherwise it will not be read that way.

2. paper

   a. should at least be moderately heavy. Flimsy paper does not look as nice or last as long. It prints better and mails better

3. printing should be

   a. large enough to be easily read
   b. dark and readable (usually dark blue or black)
   c. simple, fancy printing looks nice, but is hard to read

4. headlines - these not only make a publication appealing, but when well-written they promote interest. Good headlines can:

   a. attract attention
   b. grade the story being told
   c. sell the story
   d. tell essential facts
   e. dress up the page

example:

in the first newsletter there was a headline saying "Dr. Nadler is the first CS/CE luncheon host." A more effective headline may have emphasized the luncheon topic rather than the speaker. ex. "PRESENT TRAINING AND EDUCATION OF ADULTS SEEN AS INADEQUATE," or "IMPROVING METHOD OF ADULT EDUCATION SEES INCREASE IN SUCCESSFUL ADMINISTRATORS."

1.) use as many headlines as is needed. Never put more than one story under one headline

2.) make headlines bigger than the print of the story

They should jump out and pull the reader to the page. Also use the "down-style" when printing heads. This makes them much more readable.

5. space

a. Make sure there is enough air on the page for the copy to breathe. Nothing stops a prospective reader faster than a barrage of copy,with cluttered words and run-on stories.

6. pictures, illustrations ard graphs

a. These additions to a newsletter add an attractive visual appeal. They can be used to clarify a story, a point, or idea (a graph or illustrative chart). They show emotion or feeling (a photograph of someone arguing a point).

b. They are especially useful on the front page to attract attention and in the middle pages to break up the monotony of print.

c. Avoid cliche photos such as someone presenting an award to someone else. Also avoid repetitive photos. All graphics, like articles, should serve a purpose, and not merely be stuck in for show.

7. design the newsletter to be a self-mailer. This saves time and money.

Style and Content: "The content of a publication determines its character and impact."

1. The purpose and substance of the newsletter must be established.*

2. Formulate objectives and adhere to them.

3. A good newsletter must motivate its readers:

   a. it must coincide with the interests of its readers
   b. it must have a simple format
   c. it should have the purpose of helping readers learn as much about matters of mutual interest as possible

---

*Remember: brochures and flyers are sent to give detailed facts about times and places of events. They also outline information and give minor facts on issues and speakers. The newsletter has very different purposes and substance. I hope this has been successfully indicated in the preceeding pages.